THUCYDIDES

INTRODUCTION

Dionysius shared his profession with the subject of this essay. He is a historian criticising another historian for the benefit of a third,[1] and he does so with a practical attention to the tools of their common trade which earns our admiration for its thoroughness and evident appreciation of the difficulties of the task of writing history. No historian was more aware of these difficulties than Thucydides. He knew that the initial collection of reliable material was a formidable task,[2] that the temptation to court popularity by dramatising and romanticising the facts was great [3] and that there was more than one way of arranging historical material.[4] Dionysius is unequivocal in his praise of Thucydides's passion for truth, and for his judgment of motives and of individual character. He is less happy about Thucydides' seasonal arrangement of events, and shows by means of an analysis of book III how this arrangement destroys the continuity. He also points to contradictions, inconsistencies, obscurities and instances of false emphasis

[1] Q. Aelius Tubero. See G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World.* (Oxford) 1965 p. 129.

[2] i. 20.

[3] i. 22. 4.

[4] v. 20. 2–3.

in book I. One curious effect of these criticisms is that Dionysius and Thucydides appear to have exchanged their former roles: Dionysius has become the conscientious historian and Thucydides the rhetorician. Annalistic treatment enables Thucydides, with maximum dramatic effect, to juxtapose the Funeral Speech, with its lofty praise of Athens, and the Plague; and his dramatisation of the Melian affair, which Dionysius finds to be full of distasteful un-Athenian sentiments, serves to show the Athenian temper before the Sicilian Expedition. In some cases, on the other hand, Dionysius, writing after the composition of many highly emotionalised Hellenistic accounts of the capture and sacking of cities, finds Thucydides too cold and detached. Regarding the arrangement of book I, Dionysius's criticisms fail to take into account the fact that both the *Archaeologia* and the *Pentecontaetia* are, in their different ways, historical digests included to illustrate particular arguments which the historian has made concerning this war and wars in general. In any case, Dionysius's suggestion that book I would be improved by the removal of ch. 2–20 seems drastic, not to say arrogant. On the other hand, he has nothing but praise for Thucydides's celebrated narrative of the battle in the Great Harbour of Syracuse.[1] Although Dionysius is here discussing style, not subject-matter, Thucydides's treatment of this climactic event in the Sicilian Expedition satisfies the requirements of the right degree of emphasis for different historical episodes, which he has laid down in chs. 13–18.

The examination of Thucydides's style begins in ch. 22, and is wide-ranging. It begins with vocabu-

[1] ch. 27.

lary and word-order. Thucydides emerges as a true pioneer, not in the sense that the individual elements of his style were entirely new, but that he was the first historian to combine them. The elements are mostly those of the Grand Style, of which Thucydides has been named as a leading exponent in the *Demosthenes*.[1] But Dionysius also refers to his penchant for forming new substantives and for seeking variation, and to his use of Gorgianic figures.[2] After this excellent description of Thucydides's style a quotation from the opening chapters of the *History* is followed by a lacuna of some length, and when we return Dionysius is quoting a passage from book 4 (ch. 34). He criticises its tortuous structure and offers a clearer version of Thucydides's narrative. Then, after quoting with admiration the narrative of the battle in the Great Harbour of Syracuse, he turns to the famous excursus on revolution in book III 81ff., criticises it for its circuitous structure and obscure language and once more offers a clearer alternative. Some modern students might prefer Dionysius's version, but if they were to do so they would be seen to share his incomplete understanding of Thucydides's view of history. He betrays it when he describes this and similar passages as "narratives" (*διηγήματα*):[3] they are concerned not with action but with the study of human psychology, a subject which was central to Thucydides's conception of history. He appreciated its complexities and considered that it required an elevated, allusive style which was entirely different from that used in the narration of events.

[1] ch. 39.
[2] ch. 24.
[3] ch. 33.

When he comes to consider Thucydides's speeches in ch. 34, subject-matter precedes style once more. Since speeches are the products of the historian's invention to a greater extent than narrative, the question of the appropriateness of the words to the occasion, to the speaker and to the audience is important. Once again Dionysius contrasts good with bad. Firstly, two dialogues: he praises the dialogue between the Plataeans and the Spartans in book 2. 71–75 for its purity, lucidity and brevity, Lysianic qualities appropriate to a quasi-forensic setting. The Melian Dialogue, on the other hand, he finds offensive on grounds of both style and argument. The latter in particular offends his sense of propriety: the sentiments expressed are both unworthy of Athens and inappropriate to the situation. Dionysius's historical sense has deserted him, and the hidebound rhetorician has taken over: consequently it has not occurred to him that one of the purposes of the Melian dialogue was to dramatise the consummation of a process of change from imperial idealism, such as is portrayed in the Funeral Speech of Pericles, to the mentality of stark power politics which increasingly dominated the actions of his successors to the leadership of Athens. After these dialogues Dionysius continues to balance criticism with praise, and gives a catalogue of speeches which he admires, followed by one of those of which he does not approve. From the latter he selects two for more detailed criticism. Once more the rhetorical criterion of appropriateness dominates the discussion, but some of his stylistic criticisms are reasonable, and consistent with his judgments elsewhere. Nevertheless it is a pity that Dionysius did not approach Thucydides in this essay

with a more open mind and more of the adventurous spirit of *νεωτεροποιΐα* (innovation) and *τὸ τολμηρόν* (enterprise) which the Spartans had found in the Athenians,[1] and which Dionysius himself had previously found in Thucydides.[2] After all, Thucydides regarded his style as a challenge to his readers, not as mere entertainment, and there is no reason to believe that he would have seen any sense in attempts to compare his speeches with those delivered in the law-courts and assemblies of his day. Again, Dionysius surely exaggerates the difficulties which his style presented to his contemporaries in Augustan Rome. There interest in Thucydides arose out of Atticism,[3] and Cicero attempted to check this,[4] but his opposition stimulated men who found his own style uncongenial to turn to the historian whose style he had criticised. Among these was Sallust, and there may have been others, including no doubt many writers of lesser talent who responded superficially to the more obvious Thucydidean traits.[5]

Finally we return to Dionysius's hero Demosthenes, who finds a place in the essay as Thucydides's most distinguished imitator. The pupil is persuaded that this is Thucydides's greatest literary achievement. In spite of this, however, Dionysius has succeeded in this essay in showing how Thucydides stood out in relation to his predecessors and contemporaries in the field of historiography. He has also made many valid criticisms of his style. Partisanship does not appear

[1] Thucydides i. 102. 3.
[2] *Demosthenes*, 2.
[3] See R. Syme, *Sallust* (Cambridge, 1964) p. 52.
[4] *Brutus*, 95. 325.
[5] Syme, *loc. cit.*

until the final chapters, and by then we have a sound idea of the critic's own limitations. Altogether, the *Thucydides* is the most thorough and balanced of his critical essays on individual authors.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΑΛΙΚΑΡΝΑΣΕΩΣ

ΠΕΡΙ ΘΟΥΚΥΔΙΔΟΥ

1 Ἐν τοῖς προεκδοθεῖσι περὶ τῆς μιμήσεως ὑπομνηματισμοῖς ἐπεληλυθὼς οὓς ὑπελάμβανον ἐπιφανεστάτους εἶναι ποιητάς τε καὶ συγγραφεῖς, ὦ Κόιντε Αἴλιε Τουβέρων, καὶ δεδηλωκὼς ἐν ὀλίγοις, τίνας [1] ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰσφέρεται πραγματικάς τε καὶ λεκτικὰς ἀρετάς, καὶ πῇ μάλιστα χείρων ἑαυτοῦ γίνεται κατὰ τὰς ἀποτυχίας, εἴ τε τῆς προαιρέσεως οὐχ ἅπαντα κατὰ τὸν ἀκριβέστατον λογισμὸν ὁρώσης εἴ τε τῆς δυνάμεως οὐκ ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἔργοις κατορθούσης, ἵνα τοῖς προαιρουμένοις γράφειν τε καὶ λέγειν εὖ καλοὶ καὶ δεδοκιμασμένοι κανόνες ὦσιν, ἐφ' ὧν ποιήσονται τὰς κατὰ μέρος γυμνασίας μὴ πάντα μιμούμενοι τὰ παρ' ἐκείνοις κείμενα τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰς μὲν ἀρετὰς αὐτῶν λαμβάνοντες, τὰς δ' ἀποτυχίας φυλαττόμενοι· ἁψάμενός τε τῶν συγγραφέων ἐδήλωσα καὶ περὶ Θουκυδίδου τὰ δοκοῦντά μοι, συντόμῳ τε καὶ κεφαλαιώδει γραφῇ περιλαβών, οὐ δι' ὀλιγωρίαν καὶ ῥᾳστώνην οὐδὲ διὰ σπάνιν τῶν δυνησομένων βεβαιῶσαι τὰς προθέσεις, ἀλλὰ τῆς εὐκαιρίας τῶν γραφομένων στοχαζόμενος, ὡς

[1] *τίνας* Krüger: *τινὰς ἃς* MP.

ON THUCYDIDES

In the treatise *On Imitation*[1] which I published 1
earlier, Quintus Aelius Tubero,[2] I discussed those poets and prose authors whom I considered to be outstanding. I indicated briefly the good qualities of content and style contributed by each, and where his failings caused him to fall furthest below his own standards, either because his purpose did not enable him to grasp the scope of his subject in the fullest detail, or because his literary powers did not measure up to it throughout the whole of his work. I did this in order that those who intend to become good writers and speakers should have sound and approved standards by which to carry out their individual exercises, not imitating all the qualities of these authors, but adopting their good qualities and guarding against their failings. When I came to deal with the historians, I gave my opinion of Thucydides, but expressed it in a brief and summary manner. This I did not because I thought little of him or because I was lazy, nor because I was short of arguments to support my statements: I was brief because I was concerned with presenting my material on a scale appropriate to the work in hand; and I treated the

[1] An earlier work consisting of three essays: (1) *On the Nature of Imitation*; (2) *Authors to be imitated*; (3) *Technique of Imitation*. See *Letter to Pompeius*, 3.

[2] See note 1, p. 456.

καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐποίησα. οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀκριβῆ καὶ διεξοδικὴν δήλωσιν ὑπὲρ ἑκάστου τῶν ἀνδρῶν ποιεῖσθαι, προελόμενον εἰς ἐλάχιστον ὄγκον συναγαγεῖν τὴν πραγματείαν. σοῦ δὲ βουληθέντος ἰδίαν συντάξασθαί με περὶ Θουκυδίδου γραφὴν ἅπαντα περιειληφυῖαν τὰ δεόμενα λόγων, ἀναβαλόμενος τὴν περὶ Δημοσθένους πραγματείαν, ἣν εἶχον ἐν χερσίν, ὑπεσχόμην τε ποιήσειν, ὡς προῃροῦ, καὶ τελέσας τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν ἀποδίδωμι.

2 Μέλλων δὲ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἅπτεσθαι λόγων, ὀλίγα περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ γένους τῆς πραγματείας βούλομαι προειπεῖν· οὐ σοῦ μὰ Δία καὶ τῶν σοὶ παραπλησίων ἕνεκα, τῶν ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ βελτίστου κρινόντων τὰ πράγματα καὶ μηδὲν ἡγουμένων χρῆμα τιμιώτερον τῆς ἀληθείας· ἀλλὰ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσοις πολὺ τὸ [1] φιλαίτιον ἔνεστιν ⟨εἴτε κατὰ τὸν ζῆλον⟩ [2] τῶν ἀρχαίων γινόμενον [3] εἴτε κατὰ τὴν ὑπεροψίαν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡλικίας εἴτε κατ' ἀμφότερα ταῦτα τὰ πάθη κοινὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ὄντα φύσεως. ὑποπτεύω γὰρ ἔσεσθαί τινας τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων τὴν γραφὴν τοὺς ἐπιτιμήσοντας ἡμῖν, ὅτι τολμῶμεν ἀποφαίνειν Θουκυδίδην τὸν ἁπάντων κράτιστον τῶν ἱστοριογράφων καὶ κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσίν ποτε τῶν λόγων ἁμαρτάνοντα καὶ κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν ἐξασθενοῦντα, καὶ διὰ τοῦθ' οὗτος ἡμᾶς ὁ λογισμὸς εἰσῆλθεν, ὅτι παράδοξα καινοτομεῖν πράγματα πρῶτοι καὶ μόνοι δόξομεν, εἴ τι τῶν ὑπὸ Θουκυδίδου γραφέντων συκοφαντεῖν ἐπιβαλοίμεθα, οὐ ταῖς κοιναῖς μόνον [4] ἐναντιούμενοι δόξαις, ἃς

[1] ὅσοις πολὺ τὸ Radermacher: ὅσοις τὸ αὐτὸ MP.

other authors in the same way. It was not possible to give a detailed and thorough critique of each author's work when I had chosen to reduce my material to the smallest possible quantity. But when you expressed the desire that I should write a separate essay on Thucydides, including everything that required comment, I promised to set aside the work on Demosthenes that I had in hand, and do as you preferred.[1] Here is the essay, in fulfilment of my promise.

Since I intend to deal with my subject in detail, I 2
wish to begin with a few words about my own attitude and about this form of treatment. I do this not with you in mind and those like you, who are completely honest in your judgments and value nothing more highly than the truth, but on account of all those others who take great delight in finding fault, whether because they envy the writers of old or because they despise their own contemporaries, or for both these reasons, which are common human failings. I suspect that some readers of this treatise will censure me for daring to express the view that Thucydides, the greatest of the historians, is occasionally at fault in his choice of subject-matter and very weak in his powers of expression. Consequently, the thought has occurred to me that I shall seem like a lone pioneer breaking new and unexpected ground if I take it upon myself to discredit any part of Thucydides's work: for I should not only be going against a

[1] See Introduction, p. xxiv.

---

[2] hiatum supplevit Kiessling.
[3] *γινόμενον* Mestwerdt: *γινομένων* MP.
[4] *μόνον* Kiessling: *μόναις* MP.

ἅπαντες ἐκ τοῦ μακροῦ χρόνου παραλαβόντες ἀναφαιρέτους ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἰδίαις τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ῥητόρων μαρτυρίαις ἀπιστοῦντες, οἳ κανόνα τῆς ἱστορικῆς πραγματείας ἐκεῖνον ὑποτίθενται τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τῆς περὶ τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους δεινότητος ὅρον· ὧν οὔτε προαιρέσεις ἰσχυρὰς . . .[1] ταύτας δὴ τὰς ἐπιτιμήσεις ἀπολύσασθαι βουλόμενος ἐχούσας τι θεατρικὸν καὶ τῶν πολλῶν ἀγωγόν, περὶ μὲν ἐμαυτοῦ τοσοῦτον ἀρκεσθήσομαι μόνον εἰπών, ὅτι τὸ φιλόνεικον τοῦτο καὶ δύσερι καὶ προσυλακτοῦν εἰκῇ πᾶσιν ἐν παντὶ πεφυλαγμένος τῷ βίῳ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐκδεδωκὼς γραφήν, ἐν ᾗ κατηγορῶ τινος, ἔξω μιᾶς πραγματείας, ἣν συνεταξάμην ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτικῆς φιλοσοφίας πρὸς τοὺς κατατρέχοντας αὐτῆς ἀδίκως, οὐκ ἂν ἐπεχείρησα νῦν πρῶτον εἰς τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τῶν συγγραφέων τὴν οὔτ' ἐλευθέροις ἤθεσι πρέπουσαν οὔτ' ἐμαυτῷ συνήθη κακοήθειαν ἐναποδείκνυσθαι. περὶ δὲ τοῦ γένους τῆς γραφῆς πλείονα μὲν εἶχον λέγειν, ἀρκεσθήσομαι δὲ ὀλίγοις. εἰ δὲ ἀληθεῖς καὶ προσήκοντας ἐμαυτῷ προῄρημαι λόγους, σύ τε κρινεῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φιλολόγων ἕκαστος.

3 Ἔστι δὴ τὸ βούλημά μου τῆς πραγματείας οὐ καταδρομὴ τῆς Θουκυδίδου προαιρέσεώς τε καὶ δυνάμεως, οὐδ' ἐκλογισμὸς τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων οὐδ' ἐξευτελισμὸς οὐδ' ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον ἔργον οὐδέν, ἐν ᾧ τὰ μὲν κατορθώματα καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς οὐδενὸς ἠξίωκα λόγου, τοῖς δὲ μὴ κατὰ τὸ κράτιστον εἰρημένοις ἐπιφύομαι· ἐκλογισμὸς δέ

[1] lacunam indicavit Reiske.

prevalent opinion established through a long tradition and firmly entrenched in all men's minds, but should also be making light of the personal testimony of the most distinguished philosophers and rhetoricians, who regard that author as a model historian and the standard of excellence in deliberative oratory. And yet the principles on which his methods were based are not irrefragable. . . . Although I wish to clear myself of these counter-criticisms, which have a certain specious attractiveness for the majority, I shall be content to say no more on my own account than this: that throughout my life hitherto I have avoided this quarrelsome, contentious and indiscriminately carping spirit; I have never published anything censorious, except one treatise which I wrote in defence of political philosophy,[1] in which I attacked its unfair detractors; and I should never have attempted, now for the first time, to display against the most distinguished of the historians a malice which is neither fitting for a man of a generous disposition, nor in keeping with my nature. I could have said more about the form of this treatise, but will be content with a few words. You and other scholars must each judge for himself the truth and fairness of the arguments on which I have relied.

The purpose of this treatise is certainly not to dis- 3
parage Thucydides's chosen subject or his ability to treat it, or to pick out his faults and belittle him, or to make any criticism which discounts his successes and his virtues and concentrates upon his less effective utterances. My examination will consider the

[1] This work has not survived. See Introd. pp. xvi, xxvi.

τις τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τῶν λόγων, ἅπαντα περιειλημφώς, ὅσα συμβέβηκεν αὐτῷ κοινά τε πρὸς ἑτέρους καὶ διαφέροντα παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους. ἐν οἷς ἀναγκαῖον ἦν μὴ τὰς ἀρετὰς λέγεσθαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς γειτνιώσας αὐταῖς κακίας. οὐδεμία γὰρ αὐτάρκης ἀνθρώπου φύσις οὔτ' ἐν λόγοις οὔτ' ἐν ἔργοις ἀναμάρτητος εἶναι, κρατίστη δὲ ἡ πλεῖστα μὲν ἐπιτυγχάνουσα, ἐλάχιστα δὲ ἀστοχοῦσα. ἐπὶ ταύτην δὴ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἀναφέρων ἕκαστος τὰ ῥηθησόμενα μὴ τῆς προαιρέσεώς μου γενέσθω κατήγορος, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἰδίων τοῦ χαρακτῆρος ἔργων ἐξεταστὴς δίκαιος. ὅτι δ' οὐκ ἐγὼ τοῦτο πρῶτος ἐπικεχείρηκα ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καὶ πάλαι καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς, οὐ φιλαπεχθήμονας προελόμενοι γραφὰς ἀλλὰ θεωρητικὰς τῆς ἀληθείας, μυρίους παρασχέσθαι δυνάμενος μάρτυρας, δυεῖν ἀνδράσιν ἀρκεσθήσομαι μόνοις, Ἀριστοτέλει καὶ Πλάτωνι. Ἀριστοτέλης τε γὰρ οὐχ ἅπαντα κατὰ τὸ κράτιστον εἰρῆσθαι πείθεται τῷ καθηγητῇ Πλάτωνι· ὧν ἐστι τὰ περὶ τῆς ἰδέας καὶ τὰ περὶ τἀγαθοῦ καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς πολιτείας· αὐτός τε ὁ Πλάτων Παρμενίδην καὶ Πρωταγόραν καὶ Ζήνωνα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φυσιολόγων οὐκ ὀλίγους ἡμαρτηκότας ἀποδεικνύναι βούλεται· καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ κατ' αὐτό γε τοῦτο ἐπιτιμᾷ, ἐνθυμούμενος ὅτι τῆς φιλοσόφου θεωρίας σκοπός ἐστιν ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας γνῶσις, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ τοῦ βίου τέλος γίνεται φανερόν. ὅπου δὴ τοὺς περὶ δογμάτων διαφερομένους οὐδεὶς μέμφεται τῆς προαιρέσεως, εἰ μὴ πάντα τὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐπαινοῦσιν, ἢ που τούς γε προελομένους χαρακτήρων ἰδιότητα δηλῶσαι

character of his style in all its aspects, and will distinguish which qualities he has in common with others and which are peculiar to him alone. This makes it necessary for me to mention not only his virtues, but also the vices which are associated with them. No complete human being has the self-sufficiency to be infallible in either word or deed: the best is the man who hits the mark most often, and misses it least. Every reader should apply this assumption to what I am about to say, and not criticise my choice of subject, but examine fairly the peculiar effects of Thucydides's style. I am not the first to attempt such a task: many ancient and modern writers have tried to do the same, writing not in a contentious spirit but in order to discover the truth. I can produce innumerable witnesses to this statement, but I shall be content with two, Plato and Aristotle. Aristotle does not believe that his master Plato said the last word on all subjects, including his account of the Forms, the Good and the Ideal State; and Plato himself tries to show that Parmenides, Protagoras, Zeno [1] and several other of the natural philosophers were wrong. Nobody criticises him merely for this, for it is recognised that the goal of philosophical studies is the discovery of the truth, by which the purpose of life itself is revealed. Therefore, since nobody questions the purpose of those who argue about philosophical doctrines if they do not approve of all their predecessors' conclusions, why should literary critics who have chosen to describe an author's individual style be censured when they do not ascribe to it all the quali-

[1] Zeno of Elea, the 5th-century philosopher.

μέμψαιτ' ἄν τις, εἰ μὴ πάσας μαρτυροῦσι τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς μὴ προσούσας ἀρετάς;

4 Ἓν ἔτι λείπεταί μοι μέρος ἀπολογίας δεόμενον, ἐπίφθονον μέν τι κατηγόρημα καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς κεχαρισμένον, ῥᾳδίως δ' ἐξελεγχθῆναι δυνησόμενον, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ὑγιές. οὐ γὰρ εἰ τῇ δυνάμει λειπόμεθα Θουκυδίδου τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνδρῶν, καὶ τὸ θεωρητικὸν αὐτῶν ἀπολωλέκαμεν. οὐδὲ γὰρ τὰς Ἀπελλοῦ[1] καὶ Ζεύξιδος καὶ Πρωτογένους καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γραφέων τῶν διωνομασμένων τέχνας οἱ μὴ τὰς αὐτὰς ἔχοντες ἐκείνοις ἀρετὰς κρίνειν κεκώλυνται, οὐδὲ τὰ Φειδίου καὶ Πολυκλείτου καὶ Μύρωνος ἔργα οἱ μὴ τηλικοῦτοι δημιουργοί. ἐῶ γὰρ λέγειν, ὅτι πολλῶν ἔργων οὐχ ἧττων τοῦ τεχνίτου κριτὴς ὁ ἰδιώτης, τῶν τε δι' αἰσθήσεως ἀλόγου καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι καταλαμβανομένων, καὶ ὅτι πᾶσα τέχνη τούτων στοχάζεται τῶν κριτηρίων καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων λαμβάνει τὴν ἀρχήν. ἄλις ἔστω μοι προοιμίων, ἵνα μὴ λάθω περὶ ταῦτα κατατρίψας τὸν λόγον.

5 Μέλλων δὲ ἄρχεσθαι τῆς περὶ Θουκυδίδου γραφῆς ὀλίγα βούλομαι περὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων εἰπεῖν, τῶν τε πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀκμασάντων ἐκείνῳ χρόνους, ἐξ ὧν ἔσται καταφανὴς ἥ τε προαίρεσις τοῦ ἀνδρός, ᾗ χρησάμενος διήλλαξε τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ δύναμις. ἀρχαῖοι μὲν οὖν συγγραφεῖς πολλοὶ καὶ κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους ἐγένοντο πρὸ τοῦ

[1] Ἀπελλοῦ Krüger: ἀπέλλου codd.

[1] The most important of the logographers listed here and below are Hecataeus, whose *Periegesis* was probably one of

ties allowed to it by earlier critics, when these include some which it does not possess?

One further question remains to be answered; it is 4
an odious charge and is in favour in popular quarters, but it can easily be shown to be unsound. The fact that I fall short of Thucydides and other authors in ability does not mean that I have forfeited the right to examine their style. Men who do not possess the same artistic powers as Apelles, Zeuxis, Protogenes and the other famous painters have not been barred from passing judgment on their work; and the same is true of the lesser craftsmen who have appraised the sculpture of Phidias, Polyclitus and Myron. I need not say that the layman is as competent a judge of many things as the expert—those things which are apprehended by the irrational senses and the feelings —and that these are the faculties which all forms of art aim to stimulate and are the reason for its creation. That much must suffice for my introduction, so that I may not waste words on this subject however unconsciously.

Before I begin to write about Thucydides I propose 5
to say a little about the other historians, both his predecessors and those who flourished during his lifetime. This will show both his purpose, in which he surpassed his predecessors, and his special talents. There were many early historians in many places before the Peloponnesian War,[1] including Eugeon of

Herodotus's chief literary sources; Charon, a contemporary of Herodotus who wrote on the Persian Wars; Xanthus, whose strange tales had an Eastern flavour; and Hellanicus, an older contemporary of Thucydides who recorded many important facts of Athenian local history. See Pearson, *The Early Ionian Historians*; Usher, *The Historians of Greece and Rome*, pp. 2–3, 25–26.

Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου· ἐν οἷς ἐστιν Εὐγέων τε ὁ Σάμιος καὶ Δηίοχος ὁ Προκοννήσιος καὶ Εὔδημος ὁ Πάριος καὶ Δημοκλῆς ὁ Φυγελεὺς καὶ Ἑκαταῖος ὁ Μιλήσιος, ὅ τε Ἀργεῖος Ἀκουσίλαος καὶ ὁ Λαμψακηνὸς Χάρων καὶ ὁ Καλχηδόνιος Μελησαγόρας,[1] ὀλίγῳ δὲ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν καὶ μέχρι τῆς Θουκυδίδου παρεκτείναντες ἡλικίας Ἑλλάνικός τε ὁ Λέσβιος καὶ Δαμάστης ὁ Σιγειεὺς [2] καὶ Ξενομήδης ὁ Χῖος καὶ Ξάνθος ὁ Λυδὸς καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοί. οὗτοι προαιρέσει τε ὁμοίᾳ ἐχρήσαντο περὶ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὑποθέσεων καὶ δυνάμεις οὐ πολύ τι διαφερούσας ἔσχον ἀλλήλων, οἱ μὲν τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς ἀναγράφοντες ἱστορίας, οἱ δὲ τὰς βαρβαρικάς, [καὶ] [3] αὐτάς τε ταύτας οὐ συνάπτοντες ἀλλήλαις, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἔθνη καὶ κατὰ πόλεις διαιροῦντες καὶ χωρὶς ἀλλήλων ἐκφέροντες, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν φυλάττοντες σκοπόν, ὅσαι διεσῴζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνῆμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, εἴ τ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴ τ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἁπάντων γνῶσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἵας παρέλαβον, μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτε ἀφαιροῦντες· ἐν αἷς καὶ μῦθοί τινες ἐνῆσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ πεπιστευμένοι χρόνου καὶ θεατρικαί τινες περιπέτειαι πολὺ τὸ ἠλίθιον ἔχειν τοῖς νῦν δοκοῦσαι· λέξιν τε ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τὴν αὐτὴν ἅπαντες ἐπιτηδεύσαντες, ὅσοι τοὺς αὐτοὺς προείλοντο τῶν διαλέκτων χαρακτῆρας, τὴν σαφῆ καὶ κοινὴν καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ σύντομον καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι προσφυῆ καὶ μηδεμίαν σκευωρίαν ἐπιφαίνουσαν τεχνικήν· ἐπιτρέχει μέντοι τις ὥρα τοῖς ἔργοις

Samos, Deiochus of Proconnesus, Eudemus of Paros, Democles of Phygele, Hecataeus of Miletus, Acusilaus of Argos, Charon of Lampsacus and Melesagoras of Calchedon. Among those who were born not long before the Peloponnesian War and survived into Thucydides's own lifetime were Hellanicus of Lesbos, Damastes of Sigeum, Xenomedes of Chios, Xanthus of Lydia and many others. These men chose their subjects on similar principles and did not differ greatly in ability. Some wrote Greek history, others that of foreign lands, without any connection but divided up by single tribes and cities and published separately. They all had the same aim: to make generally known the traditions of the past as they found them preserved in local monuments and religious and secular records in the various tribal and urban centres, without adding to or subtracting from them. These accounts contained some stories which had been believed from remote antiquity, and many dramatic tales of changing fortunes which men of today would think quite silly. Those who wrote in the same dialect also tended to employ the same sort of diction—clear, ordinary, pure, concise, suited to the events and exhibiting no artificial trappings. And

[1] *Χαλκηδόνιος* codd. Μελησαγόρας Dudith: *ἀμελησαγόρας* codd.
[2] Σιγειεὺς Krüger: *ὁ σιγεὺς* M.
[3] *καὶ* delevit Radermacher.

αὐτῶν καὶ χάρις, τοῖς μὲν πλείων, τοῖς δ' ἐλάττων, δι' ἣν ἔτι μένουσιν αὐτῶν αἱ γραφαί. ὁ δ' Ἁλικαρνασεὺς Ἡρόδοτος, γενόμενος ὀλίγῳ πρότερον τῶν Περσικῶν, παρεκτείνας δὲ μέχρι τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν, τήν τε πραγματικὴν προαίρεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον ἐξήνεγκε καὶ λαμπρότερον, οὔτε πόλεως μιᾶς οὔτ' ἔθνους ἑνὸς ἱστορίαν προελόμενος ἀναγράψαι, πολλὰς δὲ καὶ διαφόρους πράξεις ἔκ τε τῆς Εὐρώπης ἔκ τε τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς μιᾶς [1] περιγραφὴν πραγματείας συναγαγεῖν [2] (ἀρξάμενος γοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Λυδῶν δυναστείας μέχρι τοῦ Περσικοῦ πολέμου κατεβίβασε τὴν ἱστορίαν, πάσας τὰς ἐν τοῖς κ' καὶ διακοσίοις ἔτεσι γενομένας πράξεις ἐπιφανεῖς Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ βαρβάρων μιᾷ συντάξει περιλαβών), καὶ τῇ λέξει προσαπέδωκε τὰς παραλειφθείσας ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἀρετάς.

6 Τούτοις ἐπιγενόμενος Θουκυδίδης οὔτ' ἐφ' ἑνὸς ἐβουλήθη τόπου καθιδρῦσαι τὴν ἱστορίαν, ὡς οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἑλλάνικον ἐποίησαν, οὔτε τὰς ἐξ ἁπάσης χώρας Ἕλλησιν ἢ βαρβάροις ἐπιτελεσθείσας πράξεις εἰς μίαν ἱστορίαν συναγαγεῖν, μιμησάμενος Ἡρόδοτον· τῆς μὲν προτέρας ὑπεριδὼν ὡς εὐτελοῦς καὶ ταπεινῆς καὶ πολλὰ οὐ δυνησομένης τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ὠφελῆσαι· τῆς δ' ὑστέρας ὡς μείζονος ἢ δυνατῆς πεσεῖν εἰς σύνοψιν ἀνθρωπίνου λογισμοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἀκριβέστατον τῶν τρόπων· ἕνα δὲ προχειρισάμενος πόλεμον, ὃν ἐπολέμησαν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Πελοποννήσιοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τοῦτον ἐσπούδασεν ἀναγράψαι· ἐρρωμένος τε τὸ

[1] μιᾶς Krüger: μίαν codd.

yet their writings are tinged with a certain freshness and charm, some more than others, and this has ensured their survival. But Herodotus of Halicarnassus, who was born shortly before the Persian War [1] and survived into the Peloponnesian War, enlarged the scope and added to the splendour of the subject. He chose not to record the history of one city or of a single nation, but to gather together accounts of many different events which occurred in Europe and Asia, and assemble them in a single comprehensive work. He made the Lydian Empire his starting-point, and brought his account down to the Persian War, including in a single narrative all the important events which occurred in the Greek and barbarian world during this period of two hundred and twenty years; furthermore, he invested his style with all the virtues which previous historians had neglected.

Thucydides came after these historians, but he did 6
not wish to confine his history to a single locality, as Hellanicus and his imitators had done, nor to follow Herodotus and bring together into a single history the deeds accomplished by Greeks and barbarians all over the world. The first he considered a paltry and unambitious subject, and one not likely to give its readers much edification; the second he thought too large a subject for the human mind to study in the closest detail. He therefore took one war, that in which the Athenians and the Peloponnesians fought against one another, and applied himself exclusively to the task of plotting its course. He retained his

[1] *i.e.* The Expedition of Xerxes, 480–479 B.C.

---

[2] *συναγαγεῖν* Sadée: *ἀγαγεῖν* codd.

σῶμα καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ὑγιαίνων καὶ μέχρι παντὸς αὐτοῦ βιώσας, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτυχόντων ἀκουσμάτων τὰς πράξεις συντιθείς, ἀλλ' οἷς μὲν αὐτὸς παρῆν, ἐξ ἐμπειρίας, ὧν δ' ἀπελείφθη διὰ τὴν φυγήν, παρὰ τῶν ἄριστα γινωσκόντων πυνθανόμενος. πρῶτον μὲν δὴ κατὰ τοῦτο διήλλαξε τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων, λέγω δὲ κατὰ τὸ λαβεῖν ὑπόθεσιν μήτε μονόκωλον παντάπασι μήτ' εἰς πολλὰ μεμερισμένην καὶ ἀσυνάρτητα κεφάλαια· ἔπειτα κατὰ τὸ μηδὲν αὐτῇ μυθῶδες προσάψαι, μηδ' εἰς ἀπάτην καὶ γοητείαν τῶν πολλῶν ἐκτρέψαι τὴν γραφήν, ὡς οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ πάντες ἐποίησαν, Λαμίας τινὰς ἱστοροῦντες ἐν ὕλαις καὶ νάπαις ἐκ γῆς ἀνιεμένας, καὶ Ναΐδας ἀμφιβίους ἐκ Ταρτάρων ἐξιούσας καὶ διὰ πελάγους νηχομένας καὶ μιξόθηρας, καὶ ταύτας εἰς ὁμιλίαν ἀνθρώποις συνερχομένας, καὶ ἐκ θνητῶν καὶ θείων συνουσιῶν γονὰς ἡμιθέους, καὶ ἄλλας τινὰς ἀπίστους τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς βίῳ καὶ πολὺ τὸ ἀνόητον ἔχειν δοκούσας ἱστορίας.

7 Ταῦτα δ' εἰπεῖν προήχθην οὐκ ἐπιτιμῶν ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὴν ἔχων συγγνώμην, εἰ καὶ τῶν μυθικῶν ἥψαντο πλασμάτων, ἐθνικὰς καὶ τοπικὰς ἐκφέροντες ἱστορίας· ἐν ἅπασι γὰρ ἀνθρώποις καὶ κοινῇ κατὰ τόπους καὶ κατὰ πόλεις ἰδίᾳ μνῆμαί τινες ἐσῴζοντο καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀκουσμάτων, ὥσπερ ἔφην, ἃς διαδεχόμενοι παῖδες παρὰ πατέρων ἐπιμελὲς ἐποιοῦντο παρα-

[1] Eugeon (Euagon?) of Samos is the probable source of this story.

physical health and soundness of mind, and survived to see the end of the war. He did not piece together his account of actions from casual report, but was able to write as a participant in some, while others which he was prevented by his exile from witnessing he learned by questioning the most reliable informants. Thus he differed from the earlier historians firstly in the choice of his subject, which was neither completely monothematic nor divided up into a number of disconnected topics, and secondly by his exclusion of all legendary material and his refusal to make his history an instrument for deceiving and captivating the common people, as all his predecessors had done when they wrote stories like those of female monsters at Lamia rising up out of the earth in the woods and glades, and amphibious Naiads issuing forth from Tartarus, half-human and half-animal, swimming across the ocean and joining the society of men, and producing from this union of mortals and divine beings a race of demigods;[1] and other stories which seem incredible and largely ridiculous to us in these days.

I have been led to speak in such terms about these 7
men not because I think they deserve criticism: on the contrary, I can fully understand how writers of tribal and local history should have encountered stories of a fictional nature; for, as I have said, in all human societies records were preserved, by common tradition in rural areas and in single repositaries in cities. These records contained legends such as I have described; and children, inheriting them from their parents took care to hand them on to the next

διδόναι τοῖς ἐκγόνοις καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους αὐτὰς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἐκφέρειν οὕτως ἠξίουν συγγράφειν, ὡς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐδέξαντο. ἐκείνοις μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ποικίλλειν τοῖς μυθώδεσιν ἐπεισοδίοις τὰς τοπικὰς ἀναγραφάς. Θουκυδίδῃ δὲ τῷ προελομένῳ μίαν ὑπόθεσιν, ᾗ παρεγίνετο αὐτός, οὐχ ἥρμοττεν ἐγκαταμίσγειν [1] τῇ διηγήσει τὰς θεατρικὰς γοητείας οὐδὲ πρὸς τὴν ἀπάτην ἁρμόττεσθαι τῶν ἀναγνωσομένων, ἣν ἐκεῖναι πεφύκασι φέρειν αἱ συντάξεις, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ὠφέλειαν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ τῆς ἱστορίας δεδήλωκε κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως γράφων· "καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φαίνεται· ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γεγονότων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἕξει· κτῆμά τε ἐς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν ξύγκειται."

8 Μαρτυρεῖται δὲ τῷ ἀνδρὶ τάχα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ῥητόρων, εἰ δὲ μή, τῶν γε πλείστων, ὅτι καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἧς ἱέρειαν [2] εἶναι τὴν ἱστορίαν βουλόμεθα, πλείστην ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, οὔτε προστιθεὶς τοῖς πράγμασιν οὐδὲν ὃ μὴ δίκαιον οὔτε ἀφαιρῶν, οὐδὲ ἐνεξουσιάζων τῇ γραφῇ, ἀνέγκλητον δὲ καὶ καθαρὰν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἀπὸ παντὸς φθόνου καὶ πάσης κολακείας φυλάττων, μάλιστα δ' ἐν ταῖς περὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν

[1] ἐγκαταμίσγειν Kiessling: ἐγκαταμίγνυν MP.
[2] ἱέρειαν Reiske, correctorem codicis Bodleiani sequens: ερὰν codd.

generation, and expected those wishing to publish them to write them down in the form in which they had received them from antiquity. Thus these local historians were obliged to embellish their accounts with mythological digressions. Thucydides, however, chose a single episode in which he personally participated: it was therefore inappropriate for him to adulterate his narrative with entertaining fantasies or to arrange it in a way which would confuse his readers, as his predecessors' compositions would naturally do. His purpose was to benefit his readers, as he himself has made clear in the introduction of his history, in a passage in which the actual words are as follows:[1]

"The absence of legend from my history seems less attractive to a listener; but if it should be judged useful by those who wish to have a clear view of the past from which to interpret the future, which in the nature of human affairs will follow a similar if not identical pattern, I shall be satisfied. My work is composed to be a possession for ever, not an occasional piece for a single hearing."

All, or at least the majority, of philosophers and 8
rhetoricians support the historian's claim. History is the High Priestess of Truth in our view, and Thucydides concerned himself above all with recording the truth, neither adding to nor subtracting from the facts unjustifiably, nor allowing himself any literary licence, but blamelessly and single-mindedly maintaining the principle of avoiding all malice and flattery, especially when passing judgment on great

[1] i. 22.

ἀνδρῶν γνώμαις. καὶ γὰρ Θεμιστοκλέους ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ μνησθεὶς τὰς ὑπαρχούσας αὐτῷ ἀρετὰς ἀφθόνως ἐπελήλυθε, καὶ τῶν Περικλέους πολιτευμάτων ἁψάμενος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βύβλῳ τῆς διαβεβοημένης περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξης ἄξιον εἴρηκεν ἐγκώμιον· περί τε Δημοσθένους τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καὶ Νικίου τοῦ Νικηράτου καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου τοῦ Κλεινίου καὶ ἄλλων στρατηγῶν τε καὶ ῥητόρων ἀναγκασθεὶς λέγειν, ὅσα προσήκοντα ἦν ἑκάστῳ, δεδήλωκε. παραδείγματα δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν φέρειν οὐ δέομαι τοῖς διειληλυθόσιν αὐτοῦ τὰς ἱστορίας. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἂν ἔχοι τις εἰπεῖν, ἃ περὶ τὸν πραγματικὸν τόπον ὁ συγγραφεὺς κατορθοῖ, καλὰ καὶ μιμήσεως ἄξια. [κράτιστον δὲ πάντων τὸ μηδὲν ἑκουσίως ψεύδεσθαι μηδὲ μιαίνειν τὴν αὐτοῦ [1] συνείδησιν.] [2]

9 ἃ δ' ἐλλιπέστερον κατεσκεύασε καὶ ἐφ' οἷς ἐγκαλοῦσιν αὐτῷ τινες, περὶ τὸ τεχνικώτερον μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ πραγματικοῦ, τὸ λεγόμενον μὲν οἰκονομικόν, ἐν ἁπάσαις δὲ γραφαῖς ἐπιζητούμενον, ἐάν τε φιλοσόφους προέληταί τις ὑποθέσεις ἐάν τε ῥητορικάς. ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν διαίρεσιν καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς ἐξεργασίας. ἄρξομαι δ' ἀπὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως, προειπὼν ὅτι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένων συγγραφέων ἢ κατὰ τόπους μεριζόντων τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ κατὰ χρόνους εὐπαρακολουθήτους ἐκεῖνος οὐδετέραν τούτων τῶν διαιρέσεων ἐδοκίμασεν. οὔτε γὰρ τοῖς τόποις, ἐν οἷς αἱ πράξεις ἐπετελέσθησαν, ἀκολουθῶν ἐμέρισε

[1] αὐτοῦ Krüger: αὐτοῦ codd.
[2] κράτιστον . . . συνείδησιν delevit Sadée.

men. For example, in his reference to Themistocles in the first book, he generously lists all his virtues,[1] and when, in the second book, he considers the political achievements of Pericles, he writes an encomium worthy of the great man's far-famed reputation.[2] Again, when he has to write about Demosthenes the general,[3] Nicias the son of Niceratus,[4] Alcibiades the son of Cleinias [5] and other generals and politicians, he makes clear all that was due to each of them. It is unnecessary for me to quote examples to those who have read the whole history. These are the aspects of subject-matter in which Thucydides may be said to be successful. They are admirable and worthy of imitation. [The most important thing of all is never to lie willingly or to defile one's own conscience.]

One aspect of his composition is less satisfactory, 9
and has given rise to some criticism. It concerns the more artistic side of the presentation of subject-matter, that which is called *arrangement*,[6] which is required in every kind of writing, whether one selects philosophical or rhetorical themes. It consists of division, order and method of development.[7] I shall begin with division. My first observation is that, whereas earlier historians divided their accounts either topographically or by means of a simple chronological framework, Thucydides adopted neither of these methods of division. He took neither the places in which events occurred as his basis of division,

[1] i. 138. 3–6. [2] ii. 65.

[3] Dionysius has suffered a slip of memory: no such passage exists. [4] vii. 86. 5. [5] vi. 15. 2–4.

[6] Aristotle's word for this is τάξις (*Rhetoric*, iii. 12. 6), but [Longinus] 1. 4 and Quintilian (iii. 3. 9) use οἰκονομία. Cf. *De Compositione Verborum*, 18.

[7] A new method of division. See Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics*, p. 226.

τὰς διηγήσεις, ὡς Ἡρόδοτός τε καὶ Ἑλλάνικος καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἐποίησαν· οὔτε τοῖς χρόνοις, ὡς οἱ τὴν τοπικὴν ἐκδόντες ἱστορίαν προείλοντο, ἤτοι ταῖς διαδοχαῖς τῶν βασιλέων μερίζοντες τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἢ ταῖς τῶν ἱερέων ἢ ταῖς περιόδοις τῶν ὀλυμπιάδων ἢ τοῖς ἀποδεικνυμένοις ἄρχουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐνιαυσίους ἀρχάς. καινὴν δέ τινα καὶ ἀτριβῆ τοῖς ἄλλοις πορευθῆναι βουληθεὶς ὁδὸν θερείαις καὶ χειμερίοις ⟨ὥραις ἀκολουθῶν⟩ [1] ἐμέρισε τὴν ἱστορίαν. ἐκ δὲ τούτου συμβέβηκεν αὐτῷ τοὐναντίον ἢ προσεδόκησεν. οὐ γὰρ σαφεστέρα γέγονεν ἡ διαίρεσις τῶν χρόνων ἀλλὰ δυσπαρακολουθητοτέρα κατὰ τὰς ὥρας ἐφ' ᾧ θαυμάζειν ἄξιον, πῶς αὐτὸν ἔλαθεν, ὅτι πολλῶν ἅμα πραγμάτων κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους γινομένων εἰς μικρὰς κατακερματιζομένη τομὰς ἡ διήγησις οὐκ ἀπολήψεται τὸ "τηλαυγὲς φῶς" ἐκεῖνο "καὶ καθαρόν," ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν γίνεται τῶν πραγμάτων φανερόν. ἐν γοῦν τῇ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ (ταύτῃ γὰρ ἀρκεσθήσομαι μόνῃ) τὰ περὶ Μυτιληναίους ἀρξάμενος γράφειν, πρὶν ὅλην ἐκπληρῶσαι τὴν διήγησιν, ἐπὶ τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων ἄπεισιν ἔργα· καὶ οὐδὲ ταῦτα συγκορυφώσας τῆς Πλαταιέων μέμνηται πολιορκίας· ἀφεὶς δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἀτελῆ τοῦ Μυτιληναϊκοῦ μέμνηται πολέμου· εἶτ' ἐκεῖθεν ἄγει τὴν διήγησιν ἐπὶ τὰ περὶ Κέρκυραν, ὡς ἐστασίασαν οἱ μὲν Λακεδαιμονίους, οἱ δ' Ἀθηναίους ἐπαγόμενοι· ἀφεὶς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἡμιτελῆ περὶ τῆς

[1] lacunam supplevit Schoell.

[1] As did Philochorus of Athens.

[2] The method first used by Timaeus of Tauromenium.

as Herodotus, Hellanicus and some of his other predecessors had done; nor time, which the local historians had preferred, dividing their records according to the accession of kings or priests,[1] or by the periods of the Olympiads,[2] or by the appointment of civil magistrates to annual office. He wished to follow a new path, untrodden by others, and so divided his history by summers and winters. The result of this was contrary to his expectations: the seasonal division of time led not to greater clarity but to greater obscurity. It is surprising how he failed to see that a narrative which is broken up into small sections describing the many actions which took place in many different places will not catch "the pure light shining from afar";[3] as is clearly shown by what happens in practice. Thus in the third book (I shall confine myself to this single example) he begins his account of the Mytilenean episode,[4] but before completing this he turns to the activities of the Lacedaemonians;[5] and he does not even round these off before describing the siege of Plataea.[6] This in turn he leaves unfinished and recounts the Mytilenean War;[7] then from there he transfers his narrative to Corcyra[8] and describes the revolution in which one side brought in the Lacedaemonians and the other the Athenians. He then leaves this account, too, half-finished, and says a few words about the first

[3] Cf. Pindar, *Pythian Odes*, iii. 75.
[4] iii. 2.
[5] Not an adequate description of the contents of 7–19.
[6] 20–26, but not a complete account of their contents.
[7] 27–50.
[8] Dionysius omits ch. 51 and the conclusion of the Plataean episode (52–68); chs. 69–85 deal with the Corcyrean revolution.

εἰς Σικελίαν στρατείας τῆς προτέρας Ἀθηναίων ὀλίγα λέγει. εἶτα Ἀθηναίων ἔκπλουν ἐπὶ Πελοπόννησον ἀρξάμενος λέγειν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων τὴν ἐπὶ Δωριεῖς στρατείαν τὰ περὶ Λευκάδα πραχθέντα ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καὶ τὸν πρὸς Αἰτωλοὺς πόλεμον ἐπιπορεύεται· ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἄπεισιν ἐπὶ Ναύπακτον. ἀτελεῖς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἠπειρωτικοὺς πολέμους καταλιπὼν Σικελίας ἅπτεται πάλιν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο Δῆλον καθαίρει καὶ τὸ Ἀμφιλοχικὸν Ἄργος πολεμούμενον ὑπὸ Ἀμπρακιωτῶν καταλήγει.[1] καὶ τί δεῖ πλείω λέγειν; ὅλη γὰρ ἡ βύβλος οὕτω συγκέκοπται καὶ τὸ διηνεκὲς τῆς ἀπαγγελίας ἀπολώλεκε. πλανώμεθα δή, καθάπερ εἰκός, καὶ δυσκόλως τοῖς δηλουμένοις παρακολουθοῦμεν, ταραττομένης ἐν τῷ διασπᾶσθαι τὰ πράγματα τῆς διανοίας καὶ τὰς ἡμιτελεῖς τῶν ἀκουσθέντων μνήμας οὐ ῥᾳδίως οὐδ' ἀκριβῶς ἀναφερούσης. χρὴ δὲ τὴν ἱστορικὴν πραγματείαν εἰρομένην εἶναι καὶ ἀπερίσπαστον, ἄλλως τε ἐπειδὰν περὶ πολλῶν γίνηται πραγμάτων καὶ δυσκαταμαθήτων. ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ὀρθὸς ὁ κανὼν οὗτος οὐδ' οἰκεῖος ἱστορίᾳ, δῆλον. οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν μεταγενεστέρων συγγραφέων θερείαις καὶ χειμῶσι διεῖλε τὴν ἱστορίαν, ἀλλὰ πάντες τὰς τετριμμένας ⟨ὁδοὺς καὶ δυναμένας⟩[2] ἄγειν ἐπὶ τὴν σαφήνειαν μετῆλθον.

Αἰτιῶνται δὲ καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτοῦ τινες, ὡς οὔτε ἀρχὴν τῆς ἱστορίας εἰληφότος ἣν ἐχρῆν οὔτε τέλος ἐφηρμοκότος αὐτῇ τὸ πρέπον, οὐκ ἐλάχιστον μέρος εἶναι λέγοντες οἰκονομίας ἀγαθῆς ἀρχήν τε λαβεῖν, ἧς οὐκ ἂν εἴη τι πρότερον, καὶ τέλει

[1] καταλήγει conieci: καταλείπει codd. [2] addidit Usener.

Athenian expedition to Sicily.[1] He then begins his narrative of an Athenian naval raid on the Peloponnese and the Spartan land expedition against Doris,[2] and proceeds to the exploits of the general Demosthenes around Leucas and the war against the Aetolians.[3] Then he goes off to Naupactus and,[4] leaving these wars on the mainland also unfinished he touches on Sicily again,[5] and after this purifies Delos[6] and brings to its conclusion the war that is being waged by the Ambraciots against Amphilochian Argos.[7] What need I say further? The whole of the book is broken up in this way, and the continuity of the narrative is destroyed. Predictably, we wander here and there, and have difficulty in following the sequence of the events described, because our mind is confused by their separation and cannot easily or accurately recall the half-completed references which it has heard. But history should be presented as an uninterrupted sequence of events, particularly when it is concerned with a large number of them which are difficult to comprehend. It is clear that Thucydides's principle is wrong and ill-suited to history: for no subsequent historian divided up his narrative by summers and winters,[8] but all followed the well-worn roads which lead to clarity.

Some critics also find fault with the order of his history, complaining that he neither chose the right beginning for it nor a fitting place to end it. They say that by no means the least important aspect of good arrangement is that a work should begin where

[1] 86–88. [2] 89–93. [3] 94–99. [4] 100–102.
[5] 103. [6] 104. [7] 105–114.

[8] Xenophon continued Thucydides's narrative in his *Hellenica*, using his seasonal division, but abandoned it before reaching the end of the war.

περιλαβεῖν τὴν πραγματείαν, ᾧ δόξει μηδὲν ἐνδεῖν· ὧν οὐδετέρου πρόνοιαν αὐτὸν πεποιῆσθαι τὴν προσήκουσαν. τὴν δὲ ἀφορμὴν ⟨αὐτὸς⟩ [1] αὐτοῖς τῆς κατηγορίας ταύτης ὁ συγγραφεὺς παρέσχηται· προειπὼν γάρ, ὡς μέγιστος ἐγένετο τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πολέμων ὁ Πελοποννησιακὸς χρόνου τε μήκει καὶ παθημάτων πολλῶν συντυχίαις, τελευτῶν τοῦ προοιμίου τὰς αἰτίας βούλεται πρῶτον εἰπεῖν, ἀφ' ὧν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε. διττὰς δὲ ταύτας ὑποθέμενος, τήν τε ἀληθῆ μέν, οὐκ εἰς ἅπαντας δὲ λεγομένην, τὴν αὔξησιν τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως, καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἀληθῆ μέν, ὑπὸ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων πλαττομένην, τὴν Ἀθήνηθεν ἀποσταλεῖσαν Κερκυραίοις κατὰ Κορινθίων συμμαχίαν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς καὶ αὐτῷ δοκούσης τὴν ἀρχὴν πεποίηται τῆς διηγήσεως, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἑτέρας, κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως γράφων· "ἤρξαντο δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτοῦ καὶ Πελοποννήσιοι, λύσαντες τὰς τριακοντούτεις σπονδάς, αἳ αὐτοῖς ἐγένοντο μετὰ Εὐβοίας ἅλωσιν. διότι δὲ ἔλυσαν, τὰς αἰτίας προέγραψα πρῶτον καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς τοῦ μή τινας ζητῆσαί ποτε, ἐξ ὅτου τοσοῦτος πόλεμος τοῖς Ἕλλησι κατέστη. τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεστάτην πρόφασιν, ἀφανεστάτην δὲ λόγῳ, τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἡγοῦμαι μεγάλους γιγνομένους καὶ φόβον παρέχοντας τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀναγκάσαι ἐς τὸ πολεμεῖν. αἱ δὲ ἐς τὸ φανερὸν λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι αἵδε ἦσαν. Ἐπίδαμνός ἐστι πόλις εἰς δεξιὰ ἐσπλέοντι τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον.

[1] αὐτὸς supplevit Usener.

[1] i. 1. 2, 21. 2.

nothing can be imagined as preceding it, and end where nothing further is felt to be required; and they claim that Thucydides has not paid due attention to either of these considerations. The historian himself has provided them with the ground for this charge. After saying at the start that the Peloponnesian War was far greater than any before, in regard both to length and to the amount of suffering involved,[1] at the end of his introduction he wants to preface his narrative with a statement of the reasons for the beginning of hostilities.[2] He gives two, the real cause, which is not generally publicised—the growth of Athenian power—and the false cause, which was fabricated by the Lacedaemonians—the sending of an allied force from Athens to help the Corcyreans against the Corinthians. However, he does not begin his narrative from the true cause, in which he himself believes, but from the other point. The passage runs in the following words:[3]

" The Athenians and the Peloponnesians began the war, dissolving the Thirty Years' Peace made after the conquest of Euboea. In answer to the question why they broke the treaty I have given first the grievances and points of dispute, in order that no one may ever need to ask how the Greeks came to start so great a war among themselves. The real cause I consider to have been that which was given least publicity, the growth of Athenian power, which made the Lacedaemonians afraid and forced them to make war. But the advertised causes were as follows.

" There is a city called Epidamnus on the right as one sails into the entrance to the Ionian Gulf. The

[2] i. 23. 4–6.
[3] i. 23. 4–24. 1.

προσοικοῦσιν δ' αὐτὴν Ταυλάντιοι βάρβαροι, Ἰλλυρικὸν ἔθνος." καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο διεξέρχεται τὰ περὶ Ἐπίδαμνον καὶ τὰ περὶ Κέρκυραν καὶ τὰ περὶ Ποτίδαιαν καὶ τὴν Πελοποννησίων σύνοδον εἰς Σπάρτην καὶ τοὺς ῥηθέντας ἐκεῖ κατὰ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως λόγους. ταῦτα δὲ μέχρι δισχιλίων ἐκμηκύνας στίχων, τότε περὶ τῆς ἑτέρας αἰτίας τὸν λόγον ἀποδίδωσι τῆς ἀληθοῦς τε καὶ αὐτῷ δοκούσης, ἐνθένδε ἀρξάμενος· "ἐψηφίσαντο δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰς σπονδὰς λελύσθαι καὶ πολεμεῖν Ἀθηναίοις οὐ τοσοῦτον τῶν συμμάχων πεισθέντες τοῖς λόγοις, ὅσον φοβούμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, μὴ ἐπὶ μεῖζον δυνηθῶσιν, ὁρῶντες αὐτοῖς τὰ πολλὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑποχείρια ἤδη ὄντα. οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα, ἐν οἷς ηὐξήθησαν." οἷς ἐπιτίθησι τὰ ἔργα τῆς πόλεως, ὅσα μετὰ τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον ἕως τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ διεπράξαντο, κεφαλαιωδῶς καὶ ἐπιτροχάδην ἐν ἐλάττοσιν ἢ πεντακοσίοις στίχοις. ἀναμνησθεὶς δ' ὅτι πρότερα τῶν Κερκυραϊκῶν ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἀπ' ἐκείνων ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ πόλεμος ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τούτων, ταῦτα πάλιν κατὰ λέξιν γράφει· "μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἤδη γίγνεται οὐ πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ὕστερον τὰ προειρημένα, τά τε Κερκυραϊκὰ καὶ τὰ Ποτιδαιατικὰ καὶ ὅσα πρόφασις τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου κατέστη. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ὅσα ἔπραξαν οἱ Ἕλληνες πρός τε ἀλλήλους καὶ πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον, ἐγένοντο ἐν ἔτεσι πεντήκοντα μάλιστα μεταξὺ τῆς τε Ξέρξου ἀναχωρήσεως καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου· ἐν οἷς οἱ

neighbourhood is inhabited by the barbarian Taulantians, an Illyrian people. . . ."

After this he describes the operations at Epidamnus, Corcyra and Potidaea, the assembly of the Peloponnesians at Sparta, and the speeches made there against the Athenians. He allows his account of these events to extend to some two thousand lines, and only then deals with the true cause in which he himself believes. He begins thus:[1]

"The Lacedaemonians decided that the treaty had been broken and that war must be declared, not so much because they were persuaded by the arguments of their allies as because they feared that Athenian power would increase, seeing most of Greece already under their sway. The expansion of the Athenian empire took place through the following course of events. . . ."

He then describes all the activities of the city in the years between the Persian and the Peloponnesian War, skimming over them summarily in the space of fewer than five hundred lines. Then, after noting that these events preceded the Corcyrean episode, and that the war had its origins not in the latter but in the former, he goes on to write the following passage:[2]

"Not many years afterwards occurred the affairs of Corcyra and Potidaea already narrated, and the other events that were a pretext for this war. Approximately fifty years elapsed between the retreat of Xerxes and the beginning of the war: all these operations of the Greeks against one another and against the barbarian took place during those

[1] i. 88–89.1.
[2] i. 118. 1–2.

Ἀθηναῖοι τήν τε ἀρχὴν ἐγκρατεστέραν κατεστήσαντο καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ μέγα ἐχώρησαν δυνάμεως, οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι αἰσθόμενοι οὔτε ἐκώλυον, εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ βραχύ, ἡσύχαζόν τε τὸ πλέον τοῦ χρόνου, ὄντες μὲν καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μὴ ταχεῖς ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ἦν μὴ ἀναγκάζωνται, τότε δέ τι καὶ πολέμοις οἰκείοις ἐξειργόμενοι· πλὴν ἡ δύναμις τῶν Ἀθηναίων σαφῶς ᾔρετο καὶ τῆς συμμαχίας αὐτῶν ἥπτετο· τότε δὲ οὐκέτι ἐποιοῦντο ἀνασχετόν, ἀλλ' ἐπιχειρητέα ἐδόκει εἶναι πάσῃ προθυμίᾳ, καὶ καθαιρετέα ἡ ἰσχύς, ἣν δύνωνται, ἀραμένοις τόνδε
11 τὸν πόλεμον." ἐχρῆν δὲ αὐτὸν ἀρξάμενον τὰς αἰτίας τοῦ πολέμου ζητεῖν πρῶτον ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ ἑαυτῷ δοκοῦσαν. ἥ τε γὰρ φύσις ἀπῄτει τὰ πρότερα τῶν ὑστέρων ἄρχειν καὶ τἀληθῆ πρὸ τῶν ψευδῶν λέγεσθαι, ἥ τε τῆς διηγήσεως εἰσβολὴ κρείττων ἂν ἐγίνετο μακρῷ, τοιαύτης οἰκονομίας τυχοῦσα. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖνό τις ἂν εἰπεῖν ἔχοι τῶν ἀπολογεῖσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ βουλομένων, ὅτι μικρὰ καὶ οὐκ ἄξια λόγου τὰ πράγματα ἦν ἢ κοινὰ καὶ κατημαξευμένα τοῖς πρὸ αὐτοῦ, ὥστε μὴ δεῖν ἀπὸ τούτων ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὡς ἐκλειφθέντα τὸν τόπον τοῦτον ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἄξιον ἱστορίας ὑπείληφεν, αὐταῖς λέξεσιν οὕτως γράφων· " ἔγραψα δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην, διότι τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἅπασιν ἐκλιπὲς τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο ἦν· καὶ ἢ τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικὰ ξυνετίθεσαν, ἢ αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικά. τούτων δὲ ὥνπερ καὶ ἥψατο ἐν

[1] i. 97. 2.

years, and in that period the Athenians acquired a firmer hold on their empire and at home advanced to the height of their power. The Lacedaemonians saw what was happening, but for most of the time remained inactive and hardly attempted to interfere. They had never made war readily before this time unless compelled to do so, and were now somewhat embarrassed by wars near home. But the power of the Athenians was manifestly increasing and was threatening Sparta's allies. They now felt that the situation could no longer be endured, but that they must make a wholehearted effort to overthrow Athenian power, if they could, by starting this war."

11 But he ought to have stated at the beginning of his enquiry into the true causes of the war the cause which he considered to be the true one: for not only was it a natural requirement that prior events should have precedence over later ones, and true causes be stated before false ones, but the start of his narrative would have been far more powerful if he had adopted this arrangement. It would not even be possible for anyone wishing to defend his methods to argue that these events were minor and insignificant, or that they were well-known and had become hackneyed by previous reference, so that it was unnecessary to start with them. He himself considered that it was because this period had been neglected by earlier writers that it merited historical enquiry; and he says so in an actual passage:[1]

"I have gone out of my way to write about this period because the writers who have preceded me have neglected it, treating either of Greek affairs before the Persian Wars, or of the Wars themselves. The only author to deal with the intervening period is

τῇ Ἀττικῇ συγγραφῇ Ἑλλάνικος, βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη· ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἐν
12 οἵῳ τρόπῳ κατέστη." ἱκανὸν μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῦτο τεκμήριον ἦν τοῦ μὴ κατὰ τὸν ἄριστον τρόπον ᾠκονομῆσθαι τὴν διήγησιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, λέγω δὴ τὸ μὴ τὴν κατὰ φύσιν ἔχειν ἀρχήν. πρόσεστι δὲ τούτῳ καὶ τὸ μὴ εἰς ἃ ἔδει [1] κεφάλαια τετελευτηκέναι τὴν ἱστορίαν. ἔτη γὰρ ἑπτὰ καὶ εἴκοσιν περιειληφότος τοῦ πολέμου, πάντα τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ἕως τῆς καταλύσεως αὐτοῦ βιώσας, μέχρι τοῦ δευτέρου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ κατεβίβασεν ἔτους τὴν ἱστορίαν, τῇ περὶ Κυνὸς σῆμα ναυμαχίᾳ τὴν ὀγδόην βύβλον παρεκτείνας, καὶ ταῦτα προειρηκὼς ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ πάντα περιλήψεσθαι τὰ πραχθέντα κατὰ τόνδε τὸν πόλεμον· καὶ ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ βύβλῳ πάλιν συνκεφαλαιοῦται τοὺς χρόνους, ἀφ' οὗ τε ἤρξατο καὶ μέχρι οὗ προελθὼν κατελύθη, ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν γεγραφώς· " καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ χρησμῶν τι ἰσχυρισαμένοις μόνον δὴ τοῦτο ὀχυρῶς ξυμβάν. ἀεὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ μέμνημαι καὶ ἀρχομένου τοῦ πολέμου καὶ μέχρι οὗ ἐτελεύτησε προφερόμενον ὑπὸ πολλῶν, ὅτι τρὶς ἐννέα ἔτη δέοι γενέσθαι αὐτόν. ἐπεβίων δὲ διὰ παντὸς αὐτοῦ, αἰσθανόμενός τε τῇ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ προσέχων τὴν γνώμην, ὅπως ἀκριβῶς τι εἴσομαι· καὶ ξυνέβη μοι φεύγειν τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ ἔτη εἴκοσι μετὰ τὴν εἰς Ἀμφίπολιν στρατηγίαν, καὶ γενομένῳ παρ' ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ οὐχ ἧσσον τοῖς Πελοποννησίοις διὰ τὴν φυγὴν καθ' ἡσυχίαν τι αὐτῶν μᾶλλον αἰσθέσθαι. τὴν

[1] ἔδει Krüger: δεῖ codd.

Hellanicus, in his Attic History; but his treatment is brief and chronologically inaccurate. My digression also serves to explain how the Athenian empire was established."

This, then, would have been sufficient in itself to 12
prove that his own narrative is not organised in the best possible way, by which I mean that it does not begin at the natural starting-point; and there is a further impression that his history does not end at an appropriate finishing-point. For although the war lasted twenty-seven years and he lived to see its conclusion, he brought his narrative down only to the twenty-second year by concluding the eighth book with the Battle of Cynossema, in spite of having expressed the intention in his introduction to include all the events of the war.[1] And again in the fifth book he reckons up the date at which it began and that which it had reached when it came to an end, in these words:[2]

"And those who put their faith in oracles were justified by the event in this one instance: for I well remember how, from the beginning to the end of the war, there was a current saying that it was to last thrice nine years. I lived through the whole of it, was of an age to follow it intelligently and took pains to discover the exact truth. It happened that I was banished from my country for twenty years after my command at Amphipolis. I was a witness of events on both sides, the Peloponnesian quite as much as the Athenian, because of my exile, and hence was better able to observe some of them at leisure. I shall

[1] Thucydides does not imply this purpose until v. 26.
[2] v. 26. 3–6.

οὖν μετὰ τὰ δέκα ἔτη διαφοράν τε καὶ ξύγχυσιν τῶν σπονδῶν καὶ τὰ ἔπειτα, ὡς ἐπολεμήθη, ἐξηγήσομαι."

13 "Ὅτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἐξεργασίας τῶν κεφαλαίων ἧττον ἐπιμελὴς ἐστιν, ἢ πλείονας τοῦ δέοντος λόγους ἀποδιδοὺς τοῖς ἐλαττόνων δεομένοις ἢ ῥᾳθυμότερον ἐπιτρέχων τὰ δεόμενα πλείονος ἐξεργασίας, πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις βεβαιῶσαι δυνάμενος ὀλίγοις χρήσομαι· τὰς μὲν πρώτας Ἀθηναίων καὶ Πελοποννησίων ναυμαχίας ἀμφοτέρας περὶ τὴν τελευτὴν τῆς δευτέρας βύβλου γράφειν ἀρξάμενος, ἐν αἷς πρὸς ἑπτὰ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ναῦς Πελοποννησίων εἴκοσι ναυσὶν Ἀθηναῖοι μόνοι * * * * πρὸς πολλαπλασίους τῶν βαρβάρων ναυμαχήσαντες ἃς μὲν διέφθειρον, ἃς δ' αὐτάνδρους ἔλαβον οὐκ ἐλάττους ἢ ὅσας ἔστειλαν ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον. θήσω δὲ καὶ τὴν λέξιν αὐτοῦ. "Ἐγένετο μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐπ' Εὐρυμέδοντι ποταμῷ ἐν Παμφυλίᾳ πεζομαχία καὶ ναυμαχία Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς Μήδους, καὶ ἐνίκων τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀμφότερα Ἀθηναῖοι Κίμωνος τοῦ Μιλτιάδου στρατηγοῦντος, καὶ εἷλον τριήρεις Φοινίκων καὶ διέφθειρον τὰς πάσας διακοσίας." ὅμοια δ' ἐστὶ παρ' αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς πεζικὰς μάχας ἢ μηκυνόμενα πέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἢ συναγόμενα εἰς ἔλαττον τοῦ μετρίου. τὰ μέν γε περὶ Πύλον Ἀθηναίοις πραχθέντα καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν Σφακτηρίαν καλουμένην νῆσον, ἐν ᾗ Λακεδαιμονίους κατακλείσαντες ἐξεπολιόρκησαν, ἀρξάμενος ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ

---

[1] ii. 83. [2] i. 100. 1.

therefore now narrate the quarrels which broke the treaty after the Ten Years' War, and the events of the war which followed."

I shall next show that he is not careful enough in 13
the development of certain episodes, either according too much space to unimportant matters, or skimming too nonchalantly over those requiring more thorough treatment. I could support this statement with many examples, but will use only a few. After beginning, towards the end of the second book,[1] to describe the 429 B.C.
first two sea-battles between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians, in which the Athenians on their own engaged forty-seven Peloponnesian ships with twenty of their own. . . .

(*Lacuna*)

. . . fought against far larger numbers of barbarians and destroyed some of their ships, while those which were captured with their crews were no fewer in number than those which the Greeks had commissioned for the war. I shall quote his account of this battle:[2]

"After this the Athenians and their allies fought a 468 B.C.
land and a sea battle against the Persians at the Eurymedon river in Pamphylia, and were victorious in both on the same day under Cimon the son of Miltiades; and they captured and destroyed Phoenician vessels numbering two hundred in all."

His treatment of land-battles is similar, being either unnecessarily extended or excessively condensed. His narrative of Athenian operations at Pylos and the island called Sphacteria, where they blockaded the 425 B.C.
Lacedaemonians and carried their position by siege,

βύβλῳ διηγεῖσθαι καὶ μεταξὺ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε πράξεις τινὰς ἑτέρας παραδιηγησάμενος, εἶτ' αὖθις ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπόδοσιν τῶν ἑξῆς, ἅπαντα τὰ γεγενημένα κατὰ τὰς μάχας ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων διελήλυθεν ἀκριβῶς καὶ δυνατῶς, πλείους ἢ τριακοσίους στίχους αὐτὸς ἀποδεδωκὼς ταῖς μάχαις, καὶ ταῦτα οὐ πολλῶν ὄντων οὔτε τῶν ἀπολομένων οὔτε τῶν παραδόντων τὰ ὅπλα. αὐτός γέ τοι συγκεφαλαιούμενος τὰ περὶ τὴν μάχην κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως γράφει· "ἀπέθανον δὲ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ καὶ ζῶντες ἐλήφθησαν τοσοίδε· εἴκοσι μὲν ὁπλῖται διέβησαν καὶ τετρακόσιοι οἱ πάντες· τούτων ζῶντες ἐκομίσθησαν ὀκτὼ ἀποδέοντες τριακόσιοι, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἀπέθανον. καὶ Σπαρτιᾶται τούτων ἦσαν εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν τῶν ζώντων, Ἀθηναίων δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ διεφθάρησαν."

14 Τῆς δὲ Νικίου στρατηγίας μνησθείς, ὅτε ναῦς ἑξήκοντα καὶ δισχιλίους ⟨ὁπλίτας⟩ Ἀθηναίων ἐπαγόμενος ἐπὶ Πελοπόννησον ἔπλευσε, κατακλείσας δὲ Λακεδαιμονίους εἰς τὰ φρούρια, τοὺς ἐν Κυθήροις ⟨καὶ τοὺς ἐν Θυρέᾳ⟩ κατοικοῦντας Αἰγινήτας ἐξεπολιόρκησε καὶ τῆς ἄλλης Πελοποννήσου πολλὴν ἐδῄωσεν, ἐξ ἧς αἰχμαλώτων πλῆθος ἐπαγόμενος ἀπέπλευσεν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας, οὕτως εἴρηκεν ἐπιτροχάδην, περὶ μὲν τῶν ἐν Κυθήροις πραγμάτων· "καὶ μάχης γενομένης ὀλίγον μέν τινα χρόνον ὑπέστησαν οἱ Κυθήριοι· ἔπειτα τραπόμενοι κατέφυγον εἰς τὴν ἄνω πόλιν καὶ

is an example. He begins his account in the fourth book, and digresses to narrate certain other events which took place while this campaign was in progress. Then returning to his account of the succeeding actions, he describes with accuracy and force all that both sides did in the fighting, deliberately devoting more than three hundred lines to these battles, although the numbers who died or who laid down their arms were not great. In fact he himself concludes his narrative of the battle with these words:[1]

"The numbers of those who were killed or taken alive were as follows: Of the four hundred and twenty hoplites in all who made the crossing over to the island, two hundred and ninety-two were brought back alive to Athens; the rest perished. Of the survivors one hundred and twenty were full Spartan citizens. A small number of Athenians only were killed."

Alluding to the campaign conducted by Nicias,[2] 14
when he sailed against the Peloponnese with sixty ships and two thousand Athenian hoplites on board, shut the Lacedaemonians up in their guard-posts, reduced to surrender the Aeginetan colonists on the 424 B.C.
island of Cythera and in Thyrea, and ravaged wide areas of the Peloponnese as well, and after taking large numbers of prisoners sailed back to Athens, Thucydides rapidly sketches the operations in Cythera with these words:[3]

"A battle was fought, in which the Cytherians held their ground for a short time, then turned and fled to the upper city. Later they came to terms with

[1] iv. 38. 5.
[2] iv. 53–57.
[3] iv. 54. 2.

ὕστερον συνέβησαν πρὸς Νικίαν καὶ τοὺς ξυνάρχοντας, Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιτρέψαι περὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν πλὴν θανάτου." περὶ δὲ τῆς Αἰγινητῶν ἀλώσεως τῶν ἐν Θυρέᾳ· "ἐν τούτῳ δ' οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κατασχόντες καὶ χωρήσαντες εὐθὺς πάσῃ τῇ στρατιᾷ αἱροῦσι τὴν Θυρέαν, καὶ τήν τε πόλιν κατέκαυσαν καὶ τὰ ἐνόντα ἐξεπόρθησαν, τούς τε Αἰγινήτας, ὅσοι μὴ ἐν χερσὶ διεφθάρησαν, ἄγοντες ἀφίκοντο εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας." γενομένων δὲ περὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀμφοτέρας εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ πολέμου μεγάλων συμφορῶν, δι' ἃς ἐπεθύμησαν ἀμφότεραι τῆς εἰρήνης, περὶ μὲν τῆς προτέρας, ὅτε Ἀθηναῖοι τετμημένης μὲν αὐτοῖς τῆς χώρας, οἰκοφθορημένης δὲ τῆς πόλεως ὑπὸ λοιμοῦ, πᾶσαν ἀπογνόντες βοήθειαν ἄλλην, ἀπέστειλαν πρεσβείαν εἰς Σπάρτην εἰρήνης τυχεῖν δεόμενοι, οὔτε τοὺς ἀποσταλέντας ἄνδρας εἴρηκεν οὔτε τοὺς ῥηθέντας ἐκεῖ λόγους ὑπ' αὐτῶν οὔτε τοὺς ἐναντιωθέντας, ὑφ' ὧν πεισθέντες Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὰς διαλλαγὰς ἀπεψηφίσαντο· φαύλως δέ πως καὶ ῥᾳθύμως ὡς περὶ μικρῶν καὶ ἀδόξων πραγμάτων ταῦτα εἴρηκε· "μετὰ δὲ τὴν δευτέραν εἰσβολὴν τῶν Πελοποννησίων οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς ἥ τε γῆ αὐτῶν ἐτέτμητο τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἡ νόσος ἐπέκειτο ἅμα καὶ ὁ πόλεμος, ἠλλοίωντο τὰς γνώμας, καὶ τὸν Περικλέα ἐν αἰτίᾳ εἶχον ὡς πείσαντα σφᾶς πολεμεῖν καὶ δι' ἐκεῖνον ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς περιπεπτωκότες· πρὸς δὲ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ὥρμηντο συγχωρεῖν, καὶ πρέσβεις τινὰς πέμψαντες πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄπρακτοι ἐγένοντο."

[1] iv. 57. 3.

Nicias and his colleagues, agreeing to place themselves in the Athenians' power on condition that their lives were spared."

And concerning the capture of the Aeginetans at Thyrea, he says:[1]

"Meanwhile the Athenians put in to land and immediately marched on Thyrea with their whole force, and captured it. They burnt the city and ravaged its contents, and carried away with them to Athens all the Aeginetans who had not fallen in the battle."

And when both cities, at the very outset of the war, had suffered major disasters which caused them to desire peace, with regard to the former one, when the Athenians, whose land had been ravaged and their city depopulated by the plague, despairing of every other remedy sent an embassy to Sparta to sue for 430 B.C. peace, Thucydides does not give the names of the ambassadors or record the speeches they made there, nor the names of the opposing speakers whose arguments persuaded the Lacedaemonians to reject an armistice. His narrative is a rather jejune and careless affair, as if the episode were a minor one of no importance:[2]

"After the second Peloponnesian invasion, when their land had been ravaged once more, and the plague and the war together lay heavily upon the Athenians, a change came over their spirit. They blamed Pericles because he had persuaded them to go to war, and they felt that he was the cause of their falling into such misfortunes; and they were anxious to come to terms with the Lacedaemonians. They therefore sent envoys to them, but these met with no success."

[2] ii. 59. 1–2.

περὶ δὲ τῆς ὑστέρας, ὅτε Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοὺς περὶ Πύλον ἁλόντας τριακοσίους κομίσασθαι προθέμενοι πρεσβείαν [1] ἀπέστειλαν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας, καὶ τοὺς λόγους εἴρηκε τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου ῥηθέντας τότε καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἐπελήλυθε, δι' ἃς οὐκ ἐπετελέσθησαν αἱ σπονδαί. εἰ μὲν οὖν [2] ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πρεσβείας ⟨ἦ⟩ τὰ κεφάλαια τῶν γινομένων περιειληφυῖα δήλωσις ἦρκει, λόγων δὲ καὶ παρακλήσεων, αἷς ἐχρήσαντο οἱ πρέσβεις, οὐδὲν ἔδει, μήτε πεισθέντων μήτε δεξαμένων τὰς σπονδὰς Λακεδαιμονίων, τί δή ποτε οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν προαίρεσιν ἐφύλαξε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Σπάρτης ἀφικομένων εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας; οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι διαπραξάμενοι τὴν εἰρήνην ἀπῆλθον. εἰ δ' ἀκριβῶς ἔδει [3] ταῦτα εἰρῆσθαι, διὰ τί παρέλιπε ῥαθύμως ἐκεῖνα; οὐ γὰρ δή γε ἀσθενείᾳ δυνάμεως ἐξείργετο περὶ ἀμφοτέρων τοὺς ἐνόντας εὑρεῖν τε καὶ ἐξειπεῖν λόγους. εἰ δὲ δὴ κατὰ λογισμόν τινα τὴν ἑτέραν προείλετο πρεσβείαν ἐξεργάσασθαι, οὐκ ἔχω συμβαλεῖν, κατὰ τί τὴν Λακωνικὴν προέκρινε τῆς Ἀττικῆς μᾶλλον, τὴν ὑστέραν τοῖς χρόνοις ἀντὶ τῆς προτέρας καὶ τὴν ἀλλοτρίαν ἀντὶ τῆς ἰδίας καὶ τὴν ἐπ' ἐλάττοσι κακοῖς γενομένην ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπὶ μείζοσι.

Πόλεών τε ἁλώσεις καὶ κατασκαφὰς καὶ ἀνδραποδισμοὺς καὶ ἄλλας τοιαύτας συμφορὰς πολλάκις ἀναγκασθεὶς γράφειν ποτὲ μὲν οὕτως ὠμὰ καὶ δεινὰ καὶ οἴκτων ἄξια φαίνεσθαι ποιεῖ τὰ πάθη, ὥστε μηδεμίαν ὑπερβολὴν μήτε ἱστοριογράφοις

[1] ἁλόντας—πρεσβείαν Krüger: ἀλλόντας—πρεσβείας codd.
[2] ἦ transposuit Krüger: οὖν ἦ codd.

But when he comes to describe the later occasion, when the Lacedaemonians sent an embassy to Athens to try to recover the three hundred men captured at 425 B.C.
Pylos, he both records the speech delivered by the Lacedaemonian envoy on that occasion and gives all the reasons why a treaty was not concluded.

If, therefore, in the case of the Athenian embassy 15
reference to the main points in the negotiations was all that was necessary, omitting the arguments and appeals used by the envoys because these failed to persuade the Lacedaemonians to agree to an armistice, why ever did Thucydides not follow the same procedure in the case of the embassy which came from Sparta to Athens, since those envoys, too, returned empty-handed from their peace mission? Or, if it was necessary to render an accurate account of the latter, why did he neglect the former so carelessly? He certainly did not lack the ability to discover and express the arguments inherent in the two situations. There may have been some reason for giving more thorough treatment to one embassy than to the other, but I cannot imagine why he attached more importance to the Spartan than to the Athenian—more to the later than to the earlier, to the enemy's rather than his own city's, to the one made under the lighter rather than the one made under the greater weight of misfortune.

Thucydides often has to describe the capture and destruction of cities, the enslavement of their inhabitants and other similar disasters. Sometimes he is so successful in portraying the cruelty, the horror and the pitiable nature of the sufferings involved, that

---

[8] ἔδει Krüger: δεῖ codd.

μήτε ποιηταῖς καταλιπεῖν· ποτὲ δὲ οὕτως ταπεινὰ καὶ μικρά, ὥστε μηδ' εἰς αἴσθησιν δεινῶν τι πεσεῖν γνώρισμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσι τὸν ἄνδρα. λέγων τε ἃ περὶ τῆς Πλαταιέων πόλεως εἴρηκε καὶ περὶ τῆς Μυτιληναίων καὶ περὶ τῆς Μηλίων, οὐδὲν δέομαι τὰς λέξεις ἐκείνας φέρειν, ἐν αἷς ἀπὸ τῆς ἄκρας δυνάμεως ἐξείργασται τὰς συμφορὰς αὐτῶν. ἐν αἷς δ' ἐπιτρέχει καὶ μικρὰ ποιεῖ τὰ πάθη αὐτῇ ⟨τῇ βραχυλογίᾳ χρώμενος⟩[1] κατὰ πολλοὺς τόπους τῆς ἱστορίας, τούτων μνησθήσομαι· "Περὶ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους τούτους Σκιωναίους[2] Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκπολιορκήσαντες ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς ἡβῶντας, παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας ἠνδραπόδισαν καὶ τὴν γῆν Πλαταιεῦσιν ἔδωκαν νέμεσθαι." "Καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι πάλιν ἐς Εὔβοιαν διαβάντες Περικλέους στρατηγοῦντος κατεστρέψαντο πᾶσαν· καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ὁμολογίᾳ κατέστησαν, Ἑστιαιεῖς δ' ἐξοικίσαντες αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον." "Ἀνέστησαν δὲ Αἰγινήτας τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἐξ Αἰγίνης Ἀθηναῖοι αὐτούς τε καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ παῖδας, ἐπικαλέσαντες οὐχ ἥκιστα τοῦ πολέμου σφίσιν αἰτίους εἶναι· καὶ τὴν Αἴγιναν ἀσφαλέστερον ἐφαίνετο τῇ Πελοποννησίων ἐπικειμένην αὐτῶν πέμψαντες ἐποίκους ἔχειν."

16 Πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα τις ἂν εὕροι δι' ὅλης τῆς ἱστορίας ἢ τῆς ἄκρας ἐξεργασίας τετυχηκότα καὶ

[1] *τῇ βραχυλογίᾳ χρώμενος* lacunam supplendam esse putat Usener.

[2] *Σκιωναίους* Sylburg: *σικυωνίους* MP.

[1] iii. 52–68.

he leaves other historians and poets no scope to improve on his work. But on other occasions he makes them seem so trivial and petty that he lets fall no hint to help his readers to appreciate the horrors. I need only refer to his narrative of the Plataean episode [1] 429 B.C. and of the affairs of Mytilene [2] and Melos [3] without 428, 416 B.C. quoting the passages themselves, in which the sufferings of the inhabitants are described with the utmost power. But I shall quote several passages in his history in which he touches lightly on human sufferings and, by sheer brevity, reduces them to insignificance:

"About the same time as this, the Athenians took Scione by siege, killed all the adult males and enslaved the women and children, and gave the land to the Plataeans to live in." [4] 421 B.C.

"The Athenians under the command of Pericles crossed over again to Euboca and reduced the whole island. They then settled it all by agreement except for Histiaea, which they occupied themselves after ejecting the inhabitants." [5] 447-446 B.C.

"At the same time the Athenians expelled the Aeginetans from Aegina, together with their women- 431 B.C. folk and their children accusing them of being the main cause of the war. The island lies close to the Peloponnese, and they thought they would have more reliable neighbours if they sent out their own citizens to colonise it." [6]

One could find many other episodes throughout the 16 history as a whole that have been treated with

[2] iii. 27–50.
[3] v. 84–116.
[4] v. 32. 1.
[5] i. 114. 3.
[6] ii. 27. 1.

μήτε πρόσθεσιν δεχόμενα μήτ' ἀφαίρεσιν, ἢ ῥᾳθύμως ἐπιτετροχασμένα καὶ οὐδὲ τὴν ἐλαχίστην ἔμφασιν ἔχοντα τῆς δεινότητος ἐκείνης, μάλιστα δ' ἐν ταῖς δημηγορίαις καὶ ἐν τοῖς διαλόγοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ῥητορείαις. ὧν προνοούμενος ἔοικεν ἀτελῆ τὴν ἱστορίαν καταλιπεῖν, ὡς καὶ Κράτιππος ὁ συνακμάσας αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ παραλειφθέντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συναγαγὼν γέγραφεν, οὐ μόνον ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτὰς [1] ἐμποδὼν γεγενῆσθαι λέγων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ὀχληρὰς εἶναι. τοῦτό γέ τοι συνέντα αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς τελευταίοις τῆς ἱστορίας φησὶ μηδεμίαν τάξαι ῥητορείαν, πολλῶν μὲν κατὰ τὴν Ἰωνίαν γενομένων, πολλῶν δ' ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις, ὅσα διὰ λόγων καὶ δημηγοριῶν ἐπράχθη. εἴ γέ τοι τὴν πρώτην καὶ τὴν ὀγδόην βύβλον ἀντιπαρεξετάζοι τις ἀλλήλαις, οὔτε τῆς αὐτῆς ἂν προαιρέσεως δόξειεν ἀμφοτέρας ὑπάρχειν οὔτε τῆς αὐτῆς δυνάμεως· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ὀλίγα πράγματα καὶ μικρὰ περιέχουσα πληθύει τῶν ῥητορειῶν, ἡ δὲ περὶ πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας συνταχθεῖσα πράξεις δημηγορικῶν σπανίζει λόγων.

17 Ἤδη δὲ ἔγωγε καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ἔδοξα ταῖς ῥητορείαις τοῦτο συμβεβηκέναι τῷ ἀνδρὶ τὸ

[1] αὐτὰς Reiske: αὐταῖς codd.

---

[1] Probably the most distinguished of Thucydides's continuators, and possibly the author of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. See Bury, *The Ancient Greek Historians*, pp. 155–156; Bruce, *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, pp. 25–26.

[2] The eighth book has long been thought to contain signs of haste and hence of incompleteness, and it is possible that

supreme craftsmanship, to which nothing could be added and from which nothing could be taken away, while others are treated with careless superficiality, bearing not the slightest sign of his genius. This inconsistency is to be found especially in the speeches, the dialogues and the other rhetorical passages. It was probably while attending to these inconsistencies that he left the work unfinished. Cratippus,[1] his contemporary and the editor of the history as he left it, has recorded this view, and said further that they not only impede the action but also cause annoyance to the audience. It was in realisation of this, he says, that Thucydides included no rhetorical passages in the last parts of his history, although many events took place in Ionia and many at Athens which were the results of public debates and discussions. A comparative examination of the first and eighth books would suggest that they had not been composed according to the same plan or with the same literary power: for the first book contains few actions, and those trivial, and yet abounds in rhetorical passages; whereas the other is concerned with many important events, but is devoid of political speeches.[2]

I myself had already formed the opinion that even 17
in the rhetorical passages our author evinces the same

Thucydides had intended to add speeches, but was prevented from doing so by death or other circumstances. But there are good literary reasons why the first book should contain a high proportion of speeches, since it is the book in which reasons, arguments and decisions are more important than actions, and this is a proper order of priorities at the beginning of a great war. Again, the considerable amount of reported speech in the eighth book might be thought to suggest that Thucydides did not intend to compose full speeches for inclusion in this book.

πάθος, ὥστε περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καιρῷ τιθέναι μὲν ἃς οὐκ ἔδει, παραλιπεῖν δὲ ἃς ἔδει λέγεσθαι. οἷόν τι καὶ περὶ τῆς Μυτιληναίων πόλεως ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ πεποίηκε· μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἅλωσιν αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν τῶν αἰχμαλώτων ἄφιξιν, οὓς ἀπέστειλεν ὁ στρατηγὸς Πάχης, διττῶν ἐκκλησιῶν γενομένων ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις τοὺς μὲν ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ῥηθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν δημαγωγῶν λόγους παρέλιπεν ὡς οὐκ ἀναγκαίους, ἐν ᾗ τούς τε αἰχμαλώτους ἀποκτεῖναι ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσατο καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Μυτιληναίους ἠβηδόν, γυναῖκας δὲ καὶ παῖδας ἀνδραποδίσαι· τοὺς δ' ἐν τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ πάλιν ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ῥηθέντας, ἐν ᾗ μετάνοιά τις ὑπεισῆλθε τοὺς πολλούς, περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν συνταχθέντας ὑπόθεσιν παρέλαβεν ὡς ἀναγκαίους.

18 Ὁ δὲ δὴ περιβόητος ἐπιτάφιος, ὃν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βύβλῳ διελήλυθε, κατὰ τίνα δή ποτε λογισμὸν ἐν τούτῳ κεῖται τῷ τόπῳ μᾶλλον ἢ οὐκ ἐν ἑτέρῳ; εἴ τε γὰρ ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς τῆς πόλεως, ἐν αἷς Ἀθηναίων πολλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ μαχόμενοι διεφθάρησαν, τοὺς εἰωθότας ὀλοφυρμοὺς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐχρῆν λέγεσθαι, εἴ τ' ἐπὶ ταῖς μεγάλαις εὐπραγίαις, ἐξ ὧν δόξα τις ἐπιφανὴς ἢ δύναμις ἐγένετο τῇ πόλει, τιμᾶσθαι τοῖς ἐπιταφίοις ἐπαίνοις τοὺς ἀποθανόντας, ἐν ᾗ βούλεταί τις μᾶλλον βύβλῳ ἢ ἐν ταύτῃ τὸν ἐπιτάφιον ἥρμοττεν εἰρῆσθαι· ἐν ταύτῃ μὲν γὰρ οἱ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην τῶν Πελοποννησίων εἰσβολὴν πεσόντες Ἀθηναῖοι κομιδῇ τινες ἦσαν ὀλίγοι, καὶ οὐδ' οὗτοι λαμπρόν τι πράξαντες ἔργον, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Θουκυδίδης

weakness, namely that when dealing with the same subject on the same occasion he includes inessential and omits essential material. For example, in his account of the Mytilenean affair in the third book, after the capture of the town and the arrival of the prisoners sent by the general Paches, two meetings were held at Athens.[1] He omits as unnecessary the speeches made by the demagogues in the first meeting, in which the people voted to execute the prisoners and all the other adult young Mytilenean males, and to enslave the women and children; but he finds it necessary to include the speeches made by the same men at the second meeting, in which a change of heart gradually came over the majority, though the subject for which they were composed is the same as in the former debate.[2]

Then there is the renowned *Funeral Speech*, which he gives in full in the second book:[3] what possible reason can he have had for including it at this point rather than at another? If he felt it desirable to record the lamentations customarily made over the many brave Athenians who died in the fighting in their city's great disasters; or again if he wished to praise those who fell in the act of winning the great victories which brought her signal glory or power, any book rather than this would have afforded a suitable place to record a funeral speech. The Athenian dead in this case are those who fell in the first Peloponnesian invasion; but they were quite few in number, and these few had done nothing distinguished, as Thucydides himself admits. Writing at 18 431 B.C.

[1] iii. 36.
[2] iii. 36–49.
[3] ii. 35–46.

γράφει· προειπὼν γὰρ περὶ τοῦ Περικλέους, ὅτι "τὴν πόλιν ἐφύλασσε καὶ δι' ἡσυχίας μάλιστα ὅσον ἐδύνατο εἶχεν· ἱππέας μέντοι τινὰς ἐξέπεμπεν ἀεὶ τοῦ μὴ προδρόμους ἀπὸ τῆς στρατιᾶς ἐσπίπτοντας εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς τοὺς ἐγγὺς τῆς πόλεως κακουργεῖν," καὶ ἱππομαχίαν φησὶ γενέσθαι βραχεῖαν "ἐν Φρυγίοις τῶν τε Ἀθηναίων τέλει ἑνὶ τῶν ἱππέων καὶ Θεσσαλοῖς μετ' αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς Βοιωτῶν ἱππέας· ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἔλαττον ἔσχον οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, μέχρι οὗ προσβοηθησάντων τοῖς Βοιωτοῖς τῶν ὁπλιτῶν τροπὴ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀπέθανον τῶν Θεσσαλῶν καὶ Ἀθηναίων οὐ πολλοί· ἀνείλοντο μέντοι αὐτοὺς αὐθημερὸν ἀσπόνδους· καὶ οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι τρόπαιον τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ ἔστησαν." ἐν δὲ τῇ τετάρτῃ βύβλῳ οἱ μετὰ Δημοσθένους περὶ Πύλον ἀγωνισάμενοι πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίων δύναμιν καὶ ἐκ γῆς καὶ ἐκ θαλάττης καὶ νικήσαντες ἐν ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς μάχαις, δι' οὓς ἡ πόλις αὐχήματος ἐπληρώθη, πολλῷ πλείους τε καὶ κρείττους ἦσαν ἐκείνων. τί δή ποτε οὖν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς ὀλίγοις ἱππεῦσι καὶ οὐδεμίαν οὔτε δόξαν οὔτε δύναμιν τῇ πόλει κτησαμένοις τάς τε ταφὰς ἀνοίγει τὰς δημοσίας ὁ συγγραφεὺς καὶ τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τῶν δημαγωγῶν Περικλέα τὴν ὑψηλὴν τραγῳδίαν ἐκείνην εἰσάγει διατιθέμενον· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς πλείοσι καὶ κρείττοσι, δι' οὓς ὑπέπεσον Ἀθηναίοις οἱ τὸν πόλεμον ἐξενέγκαντες κατ' αὐτῶν, ἐπιτηδειοτέροις οὖσι ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς τυγχάνειν οὐκ ἐποίησε τὸν ἐπιτάφιον; ἵνα δὲ πάσας ἀφῶ τὰς ἄλλας μάχας τάς τε κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν, ἐν αἷς πολλοὶ διεφθάρησαν, οὓς

the outset about Pericles,[1] that ". . . He watched over the city and kept it as calm as he could. However, he sent out cavalry from time to time to prevent patrols from the enemy army from making sudden raids on the farm-lands near the city and doing mischief," he goes on to say that a brief cavalry battle took place ". . . in Phrygian territory between a single detachment of Athenian cavalry with their Thessalian allies and the Boeotian cavalry, in which the Thessalians and Athenians were at least a match for their opponents, until the Boeotian infantry came to assist the horse, and they were compelled to retreat. The Athenians and the Thessalians lost a few men, but recovered their bodies on the same day without a truce. The next day the Peloponnesians set up a trophy." But those who, in the fourth book,[2] fought with Demosthenes against a force of the Lacedaemonians at Pylos on land and sea, and were victorious in both battles, filled their city with a new confidence; and they were more numerous and better troops than the others. Why ever, then, does the historian lay open the public tombs for a few cavalrymen who earned no glory and no power for the city, and introduce the most illustrious public orator, Pericles, to enact his performance of high tragedy, while he wrote no funeral speech for their better and more numerous fellow-countrymen, through whose actions the invaders of Athenian soil were humbled, and who therefore were more deserving of this honour? Leaving aside all the other land- and sea-battles in which many men died who deserved funeral

425 B.C.

[1] ii. 22. 1–2.
[2] iv. 9–23; 26–40.

πολὺ δικαιότερον ἦν κοσμεῖσθαι τοῖς ἐπιταφίοις ἐπαίνοις ἢ τοὺς περιπόλους [1] τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἱππεῖς δέκα ἢ πεντεκαίδεκα ὄντας, οἱ ἐν Σικελίᾳ μετὰ Νικίου καὶ Δημοσθένους ἀποθανόντες Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἔν τε ταῖς ναυμαχίαις ἔν τε τοῖς κατὰ γῆν ἀγῶσι καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἐν τῇ δυστήνῳ φυγῇ τετρακισμυρίων οὐκ ἐλάττους ὄντες καὶ οὐδὲ ταφῆς δυνηθέντες τυχεῖν τῆς νομίμου πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἦσαν ἐπιτηδειότεροι τυγχάνειν οἴκτων τε καὶ κόσμων ἐπιταφίων; ὃ δ' οὕτως ἠμέληκε τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὥστε μηδὲ τοῦτο αὐτὸ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι πένθος δημοσίᾳ προὔθετο ἡ πόλις καὶ τοὺς εἰωθότας ἐναγισμοὺς τοῖς ἐπὶ ξένης ἀποθανοῦσιν ἐπετέλεσεν καὶ τὸν ἐροῦντα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἀπέδειξεν, ὃς τῶν τότε ῥητόρων λέγειν ἦν ἱκανώτατος. οὐ γὰρ δὴ εἰκὸς ἦν Ἀθηναίους ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς πεντεκαίδεκα ἱππεῦσιν δημοσίᾳ πενθεῖν, τοὺς δ' ἐν Σικελίᾳ πεσόντας, ἐν οἷς . . .[2] τῶν δ' ἐκ καταλόγου πλείους οἱ διαφθαρέντες ἢ πεντακισχίλιοι, μηδεμιᾶς ἀξιῶσαι τιμῆς. ἀλλ' ἔοικεν ὁ συγγραφεὺς (εἰρήσεται γὰρ ἃ φρονῶ) τῷ Περικλέους προσώπῳ βουλόμενος ἀποχρήσασθαι καὶ τὸν ἐπιτάφιον ἔπαινον ὡς ὑπ' ἐκείνου ῥηθέντα συνθεῖναι, ἐπειδὴ [3] κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος ἐτελεύτησεν ἀνὴρ τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου καὶ οὐδεμιᾷ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα γενομένων τῇ πόλει συμφορῶν παρεγένετο, εἰς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μικρὸν καὶ οὐκ ἄξιον σπουδῆς ἔργον τὸν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ πράγματος ἔπαινον ἀποθέσθαι.

19 Ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον ἴδοι τις ἂν τὸ περὶ τὰς ἐξεργασίας

[1] περιπόλους Dudith: πολλοὺς codd.
[2] lacunam indicavit Usener.

tributes much more than the ten or fifteen cavalrymen of the Attic militia, what of those Athenians and their allies who died in Sicily with Nicias and Demos- 414–413
thenes in the sea-battles, the land engagements and B.C.
finally in the lamentable retreat? There were no fewer than forty thousand of them, and they could not be given the customary burial-rites: how much more did these men deserve to be mourned and honoured with funeral speeches? But the historian has ignored these men even to the extent of omitting to say that the city decreed that they should be publicly mourned, and performed the ceremonies that were customary for those who died abroad, and appointed to speak over them the ablest orator of the day. It certainly seems unlikely that the Athenians would have conducted a state ceremony to mourn the fifteen cavalrymen, and then regarded as unworthy of any honour those who died in Sicily, whose deaths included [1] . . . and more than five thousand from the citizen levy. But it seems likely (and I shall speak my mind), that the historian composed this funeral eulogy and assigned it to Pericles because he wished to make full use of his character; and since that statesman died during the second year of the war and 429 B.C.
did not witness any of the misfortunes that befell the city after that time, he reserves this minor and uninspiring event for him to adorn with exaggerated praise.

One can see even better the unevenness of the 19

[1] In view of the δέ, a parallel clause with μέν may have dropped out, perhaps referring to the distinguished generals Lamachus, Nicias and Demosthenes, who died in Sicily.

[3] ἐπειδή Krüger: ἐπεὶ δὲ codd.

τοῦ συγγραφέως ἀνώμαλον ἐπιλογισάμενος, ὅτι πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα πράγματα παραλιπὼν ⟨τὸ⟩ προοίμιον τῆς ἱστορίας μέχρι πεντακοσίων ἐκμηκύνει στίχων, τὰ πρὸ τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου πραχθέντα τοῖς Ἕλλησι μικρὰ βουλόμενος ἀποδεῖξαι καὶ οὐκ ἄξια τῷδε παραβάλλεσθαι. οὔτε γὰρ τἀληθὲς οὕτως εἶχεν, ὡς ἐκ πολλῶν ἔστι παραδεῖξαι πραγμάτων, οὔτε ὁ τῆς τέχνης ὑπαγορεύει λόγος οὕτω μεθοδεύειν τὰς αὐξήσεις (οὐ γὰρ εἴ τι τῶν μικρῶν μεῖζόν ἐστι, διὰ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἤδη μέγα, ἀλλ' εἴ τι τῶν μεγάλων ὑπερέχει)· γέγονέ τε αὐτῷ τὸ προοίμιον, τοσαύτας εἰληφὸς ἀποδεικτικὰς τῆς προθέσεως ἐξεργασίας, ἱστορία τις αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτήν. οἱ δὲ τὰς ῥητορικὰς συνταξάμενοι τέχνας παραγγέλλουσι δείγματα τῶν λόγων τὰ προοίμια ποιεῖν αὐτὰ τὰ κεφάλαια τῶν μελλόντων δηλοῦσθαι προλαμβάνοντας.[1] ὃ δὴ καὶ πεποίηκεν ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τοῦ προοιμίου, μέλλων ἄρχεσθαι τῆς διηγήσεως, ἐν ἐλάττοσιν ἢ πεντήκοντα στίχοις· ὥστε τὰ πολλὰ ἐκεῖνα καὶ καταβλητικὰ τοῦ μεγέθους τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὐκ ἀναγκαίως αὐτῷ παρέλκεσθαι, ὅτι κατὰ τὸν Τρωικὸν πόλεμον οὔπω σύμπασα ἐκαλεῖτο ἑνὶ ὀνόματι ἡ Ἑλλάς, καὶ ὅτι περαιοῦσθαι ναυσὶν ἐπ' ἀλλήλους οἱ τροφῆς ἀπορούμενοι ἤρξαντο καὶ προσπίπτοντες πόλεσιν ἀτειχίστοις καὶ κατὰ κώμας οἰκουμέναις ἥρπαζον καὶ τὸ πλεῖστον τοῦ βίου ἐντεῦθεν ἐποιοῦντο. τί δ' ἦν ἀναγκαῖον περὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων τρυφῆς, ἢ τὸ παλαιὸν ἐχρῶντο, λέγειν, ὅτι κρωβύλους τε ἀνεπλέκοντο καὶ χρυσοῦς τέττιγας εἶχον ἐπὶ ταῖς

[1] προλαμβάνοντας Reiske: προσλαμβάνοντας codd.

historian's treatment if one considers that, while omitting many important events, he nevertheless makes his introduction some five hundred lines long as he attempts to prove that prior to this war the Greeks achieved little, and nothing worthy to be compared with it. The actual facts were not like this, as many historical events show, nor do artistic principles dictate this degree of exaggeration (for the fact that it is larger than small objects does not automatically make a thing large: this is so only when it surpasses something large). Again, the introduction contains so many elaborate arguments to prove his proposition, that it has become a sort of history on its own. The writers of the rhetorical handbooks prescribe that the introduction should adumbrate the arguments that are to be used by providing actual summaries of what is to be revealed later.[1] Thucydides has actually done this at the close of his introduction, dealing with it in fewer than fifty lines before he begins his narrative.[2] And this makes it unnecessary for him to drag in that lengthy disparagement of the greatness of Greece: that at the time of the Trojan War the whole of Greece was not yet called by that single name,[3] and that it was through shortage of food that they had begun to cross by sea into one another's territory, and attacked cities that were unwalled and inhabited in small settlements, and made most of their livelihood by this means.[4] Why was it necessary to mention the luxury enjoyed by Athenians in early times: how they plaited up their hair into top-knots and wore gold cicadas on their heads?[5] Or that the Lacedae-

[1] *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 29.
[2] i. 23.
[3] i. 3.
[4] i. 5.
[5] i. 6. 3.

κεφαλαῖς; καὶ ὅτι Λακεδαιμόνιοι "ἐγυμνώθησάν τε πρῶτοι καὶ εἰς τὸ φανερὸν ἀποδύντες λίπα μετὰ τοῦ γυμνάζεσθαι ἠλείψαντο"; ὁ δὲ δὴ ναυπηγὸς ὁ Κορίνθιος Ἀμεινοκλῆς ὁ κατασκευάσας Σαμίοις πρῶτος τέτταρας τριήρεις, καὶ ὁ Σάμου τύραννος Πολυκράτης ὁ Ῥήνειαν ἑλὼν καὶ ἀναθεὶς τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δηλίῳ, καὶ οἱ Φωκαεῖς οἱ Μασσαλίαν οἰκίσαντες ὅτι ναυμαχίᾳ Καρχηδονίους ἐνίκων, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα τούτοις ἐστὶν ὅμοια, τίνα καιρὸν εἶχε πρὸ τῆς διηγήσεως λέγεσθαι;

20 εἰ δ' ἔστιν ὅσιόν μοι καὶ θεμιτὸν εἰπεῖν ἃ φρονῶ, δοκεῖ μοι κράτιστον ἂν γενέσθαι ⟨τὸ⟩ προοίμιον, εἰ τὸ τελευταῖον αὐτοῦ μέρος τῇ προθέσει προσήρμοσε πάντα τὰ ἐν μέσῳ παραλιπὼν καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον αὐτὸ κατεσκεύασε· "Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος συνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθὺς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων· τεκμαιρόμενος, ὅτι ἀκμάζοντές τε ἦσαν ἐς αὐτὸν ἀμφότεροι παρασκευῇ τῇ πάσῃ, καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ὁρῶν ξυνιστάμενον πρὸς ἑκατέρους, τὸ μὲν εὐθύς, τὸ δὲ καὶ διανοούμενον. κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη δὴ μεγίστη τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐγένετο καὶ μέρει τινὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, ὡς δ' εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων. τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν καὶ ἔτι παλαιότερα σαφῶς μὲν εὑρεῖν διὰ χρόνου πλῆθος ἀδύνατον ἦν· ἐκ δὲ τεκμηρίων,

[1] i. 6. 5.
[2] i. 13. 3.
[3] i. 13. 6.
[4] i. 13. 6.
[5] i. 1.

monians ". . . were the first to exercise naked, stripping in public and rubbing themselves over with oil after their exercise?"[1] And what of the references to Ameinocles the Corinthian shipbuilder, who built the first triremes, four in number, for the Samians;[2] to Polycrates the tyrant of Samos, who captured Rheneia and dedicated it to Delian Apollo;[3] and to the Phocaeans, who colonised Massilia and defeated the Carthaginians in a sea-battle:[4] what occasion did he have to introduce these events and others like them before the narrative proper? 545–523 B.C. 535 B.C.

If I may be allowed to state my opinion without giving offence to gods or men, I think that the introduction would have been most effective if he had made the concluding section follow directly upon the introductory section, omitting the whole of the middle section. The whole passage would then run as follows:[5]

"Thucydides, an Athenian, wrote the history of the war between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, describing its course, beginning at the moment it broke out, and believing that it would be a great war and more worthy to be recorded than any of its predecessors. This I conclude from the fact that both sides were in every way at the height of preparedness for it, and because I saw that the rest of Greece was taking one side or the other, some immediately, and some intending to do so. Indeed, this was the greatest upheaval yet known in history, not only that of the Greeks, but including a part of the barbarian world, and extending, one might say, over most of the world. For although the events that preceded this, and those of even remoter antiquity could not, through the length of time, be ascertained clearly, yet

ὧν ἐπὶ μακρότατον σκοποῦντι πιστεύειν ξυμβαίνει, οὐ μεγάλα νομίζω γενέσθαι οὔτε κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους οὔτε ἐς τὰ ἄλλα· οὔτε ὡς ποιηταὶ ὑμνήκασι περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον κοσμοῦντες, μᾶλλον πιστεύων, οὔτε ὡς λογογράφοι συνέθεσαν ἐπὶ τὸ προσαγωγότερον τῇ ἀκροάσει ἢ ἀληθέστερον, ὄντα ἀνεξέλεγκτα καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ὑπὸ χρόνου αὐτῶν ἀπίστως ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐκνενικηκότα· εὑρῆσθαι δὲ ἡγησάμενος ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ὡς παλαιὰ εἶναι ἀποχρώντως. καὶ ὁ πόλεμος οὗτος, καίπερ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐν ᾧ μὲν ἂν πολεμῶσι, τὸν παρόντα ἀεὶ μέγιστον κρινόντων, παυσαμένων δὲ τἀρχαῖα μᾶλλον θαυμαζόντων, ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων σκοποῦσι δηλώσει ὅμως μείζων γεγενημένος αὐτῶν. καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι ἦν ἐμοί τε ὢν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθέν ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν· ὡς δ᾽ ἂν ἐδόκουν μοι ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν ἀεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστα εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένῳ ὅ τι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως εἴρηται. τὰ δὲ ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος ἠξίωσα γράφειν οὐδ᾽ ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ἀλλ᾽ οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἑκάστου ἐπεξελθών. ἐπιπόνως δὲ εὑρίσκετο, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις οὐ τὰ

[1] Dionysius now moves on to i. 21–23.

from such evidence as I am disposed, through research which has followed events as far back as possible, to trust, I believe that they were not great either with regard to wars or anything else. I have preferred not to place my trust in what the poets say about them,[1] embroidering them in exaggerated terms, or by the compositions of the chroniclers, which are designed to attract the ear rather than tell the truth, and whose subjects cannot be proved and have mostly, through the passage of time, come to be regarded as incredible fables. But I consider that I have established the facts satisfactorily from the clearest indications possible in matters of such antiquity. As to this war, although men always think that the war in which they are participating is the greatest while it is going on, but when it is over they revert to admiring wars of old more, yet an examination of the facts will show that it was much greater than any of the wars which preceded it. With reference to the speeches made by politicians on both sides either before or after the beginning of hostilities, it was difficult for me to obtain an exact record of what was said, either when I heard it myself or when it was reported to me by various informants; but I have made the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, while adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said. And with reference to the narrative of events, I did not allow myself to obtain it from the first source that came to hand, and did not trust even my own recollections, but followed up with the greatest possible accuracy both those at which I was myself present and those I heard about from others. This research involved hard work, because different eye-witnesses did

αὐτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι. καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται· ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν γεγονότων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὖθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτά, ἀρκούντως ἕξει· κτῆμά τε ἐς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα εἰς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν ξύγκειται. τῶν δὲ πρότερον ἔργων μέγιστον ἐπράχθη τὸ Μηδικόν· καὶ τοῦτο ὅμως δυεῖν ναυμαχίαιν καὶ πεζομαχίαιν τὴν κρίσιν ἔσχεν· τούτου δὲ τοῦ πολέμου μῆκός τε μέγα προὔβη παθήματά τε ξυνηνέχθη γενέσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ Ἑλλάδι οἷα οὐχ ἕτερα ἐν ἴσῳ χρόνῳ. οὔτε γὰρ πόλεις τοσαίδε ληφθεῖσαι ἠρημώθησαν αἱ μὲν ὑπὸ βαρβάρων, αἱ δ' ὑπὸ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀντιπολεμούντων, εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ καὶ οἰκήτορας μετέβαλον ἁλισκόμεναι· οὔτε φυγαὶ τοσαίδε ἀνθρώπων καὶ φόνος ὁ μὲν κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν πόλεμον, ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν. τά τε πρότερον ἀκοῇ μὲν λεγόμενα, ἔργῳ δὲ σπανιώτερον βεβαιούμενα οὐκ ἄπιστα κατέστη σεισμῶν τε πέρι, οἳ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἅμα μέρος γῆς καὶ ἰσχυρότατοι οἱ αὐτοὶ ἐπέσχον, ἡλίου τε ἐκλείψεις, αἳ πυκνότεραι παρὰ τὰς ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν χρόνου μνημονευομένας ξυνέβησαν, αὐχμοί τε ἔστι παρ' οἷς μεγάλοι, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ λιμοί· καὶ ἡ οὐχ ἥκιστα βλάψασα καὶ μέρος τι φθείρασα, ἡ λοιμώδης νόσος· ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα μετὰ τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου ἅμα ξυνεπέθετο. ἤρξαντο δὲ αὐτοῦ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Πελοποννήσιοι λύσαντες τὰς τριακοντούτεις σπονδάς, αἳ αὐτοῖς ἐγένοντο μετ'

not give the same accounts of the same events, but each was influenced by partiality or by his memory. The absence of legend will perhaps detract from the listener's enjoyment; but if it should be judged useful by those who wish to have a clear view of the past from which to interpret the future, which in the nature of human affairs will follow a similar if not identical pattern, I shall be satisfied. My work is composed to be a possession for ever, not an occasional piece for a single hearing.

"Now of earlier achievements, the greatest was the Median War: yet even this was concluded in two sea-battles and two land-battles; whereas the present war was prolonged to a great length, and yet was short for the unparalleled amount of suffering it brought upon Greece in its time. Never had so many cities been taken and depopulated, here by the barbarians, here by the inhabitants engaged in civil strife (the old inhabitants sometimes being expelled and replaced by their conquerors). Never was there so much banishment and bloodshed, the result both of the war itself and of internecine strife. Earlier tales of earthquakes and eclipses of the sun, reported from hearsay and lacking concrete evidence to confirm them, were now made to seem credible, for the former occurred over the greater part of the world and were at the same time most violent, and the latter were more frequently recorded than in earlier accounts. Some districts experienced droughts also, and resultant famines; and last but not least damaging, the plague, which destroyed a portion of mankind. All these things befell the world during this war. It was started by the Athenians and the Peloponnesians, who dissolved the Thirty Years' Peace, which was

480–479 B.C.

Εὐβοίας ἅλωσιν. διότι δὲ ἔλυσαν, τὰς αἰτίας προέγραψα πρῶτον καὶ τὰς διαφορὰς τοῦ μή τινα ζητῆσαί ποτε, ἐξ ὅτου τοσοῦτος πόλεμος τοῖς Ἕλλησι κατέστη." Τὰ μὲν δὴ περὶ τὸ πραγματικὸν μέρος ἁμαρτήματά τε καὶ κατορθώματα τοῦ συγγραφέως ταῦτά ἐστι.

21 Τὰ δὲ περὶ τὸ λεκτικόν, ἐν ᾧ μάλιστα ὁ χαρακτὴρ αὐτοῦ διάδηλός ἐστι, μέλλω νυνὶ λέγειν. ἀνάγκη δὲ ἴσως καὶ περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἰδέας προειπεῖν, εἰς πόσα τε μέρη διαιρεῖσθαι πέφυκεν ἡ λέξις καὶ τίνας περιείληφεν ἀρετάς· ἔπειτα δηλῶσαι, πῶς ἔχουσαν αὐτὴν ὁ Θουκυδίδης παρὰ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ γενομένων συγγραφέων παρέλαβε, καὶ τίνα μέρη πρῶτος ἁπάντων ἐκαίνωσεν, εἴ τ' ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον εἴ τ' ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, μηδὲν ἀποκρυψάμενον.[1]

22 Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἅπασα λέξις εἰς δύο μέρη διαιρεῖται τὰ πρῶτα, εἵς τε τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων, ὑφ' ὧν δηλοῦται τὰ πράγματα, καὶ εἰς τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν ἐλαττόνων τε καὶ μειζόνων μορίων, καὶ ὅτι τούτων αὖθις ἑκάτερον εἰς ἕτερα μόρια διαιρεῖται, ἡ μὲν ἐκλογὴ τῶν στοιχειωδῶν μορίων (ὀνοματικῶν λέγω καὶ ῥηματικῶν καὶ συνδετικῶν) εἵς τε τὴν κυρίαν φράσιν καὶ εἰς τὴν τροπικήν, ἡ δὲ σύνθεσις εἵς τε τὰ κόμματα καὶ τὰ κῶλα καὶ τὰς περιόδους, καὶ ὅτι τούτοις ἀμφοτέροις συμβέβηκε (λέγω δὴ τοῖς τε ἁπλοῖς καὶ ἀτόμοις ὀνόμασι καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τούτων συνθέτοις) τὰ καλούμενα σχήματα, καὶ ὅτι τῶν καλουμένων ἀρετῶν αἱ μέν εἰσιν ἀναγκαῖαι καὶ ἐν ἅπασιν ὀφείλουσι παρεῖναι τοῖς

[1] ἀποκρυψάμενον Reiske: ἀποκρυψάμενος codd.

made between them after the capture of Euboea. As 446 B.C.
to their reason for breaking the peace, I have first given their grounds of complaint and their differences, so that no one will ever need to ask the cause of such a great war among the Greeks."

These, then, are examples of the historian's failings and successes with regard to subject-matter.

I now propose to discuss his style, which more than 21
anything else reveals his individuality. But perhaps I should begin my discussion of this subject of style by defining its natural divisions and the qualities inherent in it, and then show the state in which Thucydides inherited the genre from his predecessors, and in what aspects of it he was the first of all to introduce innovations. I shall conceal neither the improvements he made nor his shortcomings.

It has been said many times that style in general is 22
divided in [1] the first instance into two parts—the choice of words, whereby the subject is described, and the combination of the lesser and the more important elements; and that each of these is further divided, the choice of the elementary parts of speech (namely, nouns, verbs and conjunctions) [2] being divided into direct and metaphorical expression, and combination into clauses, sentences and periods. Both of these (that is to say, simple, individual words and composite expressions), are subject to what is called figurative usage. Some of the 'virtues' ascribed to style are *essential*, and should be present in all writing, while

[1] Cf. *De Compositione Verborum*, 1, 3, 18, 20. Theophrastus designated three, adding the use of figures of speech. See *Isocrates*, 3.

[2] These three parts of speech were recognised by the earliest grammarians.

λόγοις, αἱ δ' ἐπίθετοι καὶ ὅταν ὑποστῶσιν αἱ πρῶται, τότε τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἰσχὺν λαμβάνουσιν, εἴρηται πολλοῖς πρότερον. ὥστε οὐδὲν δεῖ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐμὲ νυνὶ λέγειν οὐδ' ἐξ ὧν θεωρημάτων τε καὶ παραγγελμάτων τούτων τῶν ἀρετῶν ἑκάστη γίνεται, πολλῶν ὄντων· καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα τῆς ἀκριβεστάτης τέτευχεν ἐξεργασίας.

23 Τίσι δὲ αὐτῶν ἐχρήσαντο πάντες οἱ πρὸ Θουκυδίδου γενόμενοι συγγραφεῖς καὶ τίνων ἐπὶ μικρὸν ἥψαντο, ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναλαβών, ὥσπερ ὑπεσχόμην, κεφαλαιωδῶς διέξειμι· ἀκριβέστερον γὰρ οὕτως γνώσεταί τις τὸν ἴδιον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς χαρακτῆρα. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀρχαῖοι πάνυ καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν μόνον γινωσκόμενοι τῶν ὀνομάτων ποίαν τινὰ λέξιν ἐπετήδευσαν, οὐκ ἔχω συμβαλεῖν, πότερα τὴν λιτὴν καὶ ἀκόσμητον καὶ μηδὲν ἔχουσαν περιττόν, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα, ἢ τὴν πομπικὴν καὶ ἀξιωματικὴν καὶ ἐγκατάσκευον καὶ τοὺς ἐπιθέτους προσειληφυῖαν κόσμους. οὔτε γὰρ διασῴζονται τῶν πλειόνων αἱ γραφαὶ μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων, οὔθ' αἱ διασῳζόμεναι παρὰ πᾶσιν ὡς ἐκείνων οὖσαι τῶν ἀνδρῶν πιστεύονται· ἐν αἷς εἰσιν αἵ τε Κάδμου τοῦ Μιλησίου καὶ Ἀρισταίου τοῦ Προκοννησίου καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων τούτοις. οἱ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ γενόμενοι πολέμου καὶ μέχρι τῆς Θουκυδίδου παρεκτείναντες ἡλικίας ὁμοίας ἔσχον ἅπαντες ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ προαιρέσεις, οἵ τε τὴν Ἰάδα προελόμενοι διάλεκτον τὴν ἐν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις μάλιστα

[1] The origin of this division of virtues is obscure.

others are *ancillary*,[1] and depend for their effect upon the presence of the essential virtues. All this has often been said before,[2] so that it is unnecessary for me to speak of them now, or to discuss the many principles and rules on which these virtues are each founded; for these matters also have been the subject of precise and elaborate theorisation.

I shall briefly outline which of these qualities were 23
exhibited by all the historians before Thucydides, and which were only imperfectly realised, beginning, as I have promised, from the earliest of them. This procedure will help the reader to distinguish the individual features of the author's style more precisely. As to the very first historians, who are known to us by their names alone, I cannot imagine what kind of style they employed, whether it was plain and unadorned, without any superfluous characteristics and meeting purely functional needs, or stately, dignified and elaborate, with the ancillary devices of ornamentation. The writings of most of them are not extant today, nor are the works which have survived, including those attributed to Cadmus of Miletus,[3] Aristaeus of Proconnesus [4] and other historians like them, universally accepted as genuine. The historians belonging to the generation preceding the Peloponnesian War, who survived into Thucydides's lifetime, in general had the same literary aims, whether they chose the Ionian dialect, which was at

[2] This is the first extant explicit reference to the system, though there are indirect references to it in Cicero, *De Partitione*, 31, *Brutus*, 261, *De Oratore*, iii. 52.

[3] Reputedly the first author of a history of a single city.

[4] Or Aristeas. A semi-legendary figure associated with the cult of Apollo. See Bolton, *Aristeas of Proconnesus*.

ἀνθοῦσαν καὶ οἱ τὴν ἀρχαίαν Ἀτθίδα μικράς τινας ἔχουσαν διαφορὰς παρὰ τὴν Ἰάδα. πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι, καθάπερ ἔφην, περὶ τὴν κυρίαν λέξιν μᾶλλον ἐσπούδασαν ἢ περὶ τὴν τροπικήν, ταύτην δὲ ὥσπερ ἥδυσμα παρελάμβανον, σύνθεσίν τε ὀνομάτων ὁμοίαν ἅπαντες ἐπετήδευσαν τὴν ἀφελῆ καὶ ἀνεπιτήδευτον, καὶ οὐδ' ἐν τῷ σχηματίζειν τὰς λέξεις ⟨καὶ⟩[1] τὰς νοήσεις ἐξέβησαν ἐπὶ πολὺ τῆς τετριμμένης καὶ κοινῆς καὶ συνήθους ἅπασι διαλέκτου. τὰς μὲν οὖν ἀναγκαίας ἀρετὰς ἡ λέξις αὐτῶν πάντων ἔχει (καὶ γὰρ καθαρὰ καὶ σαφὴς καὶ σύντομός ἐστιν ἀποχρώντως, σῴζουσα τὸν ἴδιον ἑκάστη τῆς διαλέκτου χαρακτῆρα)· τὰς δ' ἐπιθέτους, ἐξ ὧν μάλιστα διάδηλος ἡ τοῦ ῥήτορος γίνεται δύναμις, οὔτε ἁπάσας οὔτε εἰς ἄκρον ἠκούσας, ἀλλ' ὀλίγας καὶ ἐπὶ βραχύ, ὕψος λέγω καὶ καλλιρημοσύνην καὶ σεμνολογίαν καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν· οὐδὲ δὴ τόνον οὐδὲ βάρος οὐδὲ πάθος διεγεῖρον[2] τὸν νοῦν οὐδὲ τὸ ἐρρωμένον καὶ ἐναγώνιον πνεῦμα, ἐξ ὧν ἡ καλουμένη γίνεται δεινότης· πλὴν ἑνὸς Ἡροδότου. οὗτος δὲ κατά ⟨τε⟩[3] τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν σχηματισμῶν ποικιλίαν μακρῷ δή τινι τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερεβάλετο, καὶ παρεσκεύασε τῇ κρατίστῃ ποιήσει τὴν πεζὴν φράσιν ὁμοίαν γενέσθαι πειθοῦς τε καὶ χαρίτων καὶ τῆς εἰς ἄκρον ἠκούσης ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα· ἀρετάς τε τὰς μεγίστας καὶ λαμπροτάτας ἔξω τῶν ἐναγωνίων οὐδὲν ἐν ταύταις ἐνέλιπεν, εἴτε οὐκ εὖ πεφυκὼς πρὸς αὐτὰς εἴτε κατὰ λογισμόν τινα ἑκουσίως ὑπεριδὼν ὡς οὐχ ἁρμοττουσῶν ἱστο-

the height of its popularity at the time, or in Old Attic, which differed but slightly from Ionic. All these historians, as I have said, cultivated a direct rather than a figurative style of writing, though they occasionally used the latter to add seasoning, as it were. All constructed their sentences in a similar manner, simply and without artifice, and even when they used figurative language to express their ideas they did not deviate from the well-worn, universally familiar language of normal speech. Thus the style of each of them has all the essential virtues, being sufficiently pure, clear and concise, and preserving the own individual qualities of the dialect chosen. But the ancillary virtues, which reveal most clearly an orator's special ability, are neither all present nor fully developed individually, but are found sparsely and in diluted form—I am referring to sublimity, eloquence, dignity and grandeur. Nor is there any intensity, any gravity, or any emotion to arouse the mind, nor any robust, combative spirit, all of which are essential to what we call genius. The sole exception is Herodotus. This historian was far superior to the rest in his choice of words, his composition and his varied use of figures of speech; and he made his prose style resemble the finest poetry by its persuasiveness, its charm and its utterly delightful effect. He lacked none of the most important and distinctive qualities of any of the genres of verse and prose, except those of practical oratory, for which he either had no natural aptitude, or which he avoided as a matter of policy because he considered them unsuitable for history.

[1] *καὶ* inseruit Krüger.
[2] *διεγεῖρον* Reiske: *διεγείροντα* M.
[3] *τε* inseruit Sadée.

ρίαις. οὔτε γὰρ δημηγορίαις πολλαῖς ὁ ἀνὴρ οὐδ' ἐναγωνίοις κέχρηται λόγοις, οὔτ' ἐν τῷ παθαίνειν καὶ δεινοποιεῖν τὰ πράγματα τὴν ἀλκὴν ἔχει.

24 Τούτῳ τε δὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ Θουκυδίδης ἐπιβαλὼν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὧν πρότερον ἐμνήσθην, καὶ συνιδὼν ἃς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἔσχεν ἀρετάς, ἴδιόν τινα χαρακτῆρα καὶ παρεωραμένον ἅπασι πρῶτος εἰς τὴν ἱστορικὴν πραγματείαν ἐσπούδασεν ἀγαγεῖν· ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων τὴν τροπικὴν καὶ γλωττηματικὴν καὶ ἀπηρχαιωμένην καὶ ξένην λέξιν προελόμενος ἀντὶ τῆς κοινῆς καὶ συνήθους τοῖς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀνθρώποις· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς συνθέσεως τῶν τ' ἐλαττόνων καὶ τῶν μειζόνων μορίων τὴν ἀξιωματικὴν καὶ αὐστηρὰν καὶ στιβαρὰν καὶ βεβηκυῖαν καὶ τραχύνουσαν ταῖς τῶν γραμμάτων ἀντιτυπίαις τὰς ἀκοὰς ἀντὶ τῆς λιγυρᾶς καὶ μαλακῆς καὶ συνεξεσμένης καὶ μηδὲν ἐχούσης ἀντίτυπον· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν σχημάτισμῶν, ἐν οἷς μάλιστα ἐβουλήθη διενέγκαι τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ, πλείστην εἰσενεγκάμενος σπουδήν. διετέλεσέ γέ τοι τὸν ἑπτακαιεικοσαετῆ χρόνον τοῦ πολέμου ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕως τῆς τελευτῆς τὰς ὀκτὼ βύβλους, ἃς μόνας κατέλιπεν, στρέφων ἄνω καὶ κάτω καὶ καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον τῶν τῆς φράσεως μορίων ῥινῶν καὶ τορεύων· καὶ τοτὲ μὲν λόγον ἐξ ὀνόματος ποιῶν, τοτὲ δ' εἰς ὄνομα συνάγων τὸν λόγον· καὶ νῦν μὲν τὸ ῥηματικὸν ὀνοματικῶς ἐκφέρων, αὖθις δὲ τοὔνομα ῥῆμα ποιῶν, καὶ αὐτῶν γε τούτων ἀναστρέφων τὰς χρήσεις, ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν προσηγορικὸν γένηται, τὸ δὲ προσηγο-

Herodotus does not use many speeches either in a political or in a forensic style, nor does his strength lie in his ability to invest events with pathos or horror.

Following after Herodotus and the others whom I mentioned before him, and perceiving their several qualities, Thucydides resolved to introduce into the writing of history an individual style which had been overlooked by his predecessors. In his choice of words he preferred those which were metaphorical, obscure, archaic and outlandish to those which were common and familiar to his contemporaries. In the construction of both shorter and longer clauses he chose the arrangements which were dignified, severe, compact and firm-footed, and those which jarred the ear by the clashing of inconsonant letters rather than those which were melodious, smooth, polished and free from any conflict of sound. To figures of speech, in which he was especially eager to outstrip his predecessors, he devoted particular attention. From the beginning to the end of the war, which lasted twenty-seven years, he never stopped revising his eight books (which are all that he left), and polishing and rounding off the individual phrases. Sometimes he makes a nominal phrase from a noun, and sometimes he condenses a phrase into a noun. Sometimes he expresses a verbal idea in a nominal form, and sometimes he changes a noun into a verb; and of the nouns themselves he inverts their normal use,

I 24

431–404 B.C.

ρικὸν ὀνοματικῶς λέγηται· καὶ τὰ μὲν παθητικὰ ῥήματα δραστήρια, τὰ δὲ δραστήρια παθητικά· πληθυντικῶν τε καὶ ἑνικῶν ἐναλλάττων τὰς φύσεις καὶ ἀντικατηγορῶν ταῦτα ἀλλήλων· θηλυκά τε ἀρρενικοῖς καὶ ἀρρενικὰ θηλυκοῖς καὶ οὐδέτερα τούτων τισὶ συνάπτων, ἐξ ὧν ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθία πλανᾶται· τὰς δὲ τῶν ὀνοματικῶν ἢ μετοχικῶν πτώσεις ποτὲ μὲν πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος ἀποστρέφων, ποτὲ δὲ πρὸς τὸ σημαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαινομένου· ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνδετικοῖς καὶ τοῖς προθετικοῖς μορίοις καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς διαρθροῦσι τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων δυνάμεις ποιητοῦ τρόπον ἐνεξουσιάζων. πλεῖστα δ' ἄν τις ⟨εὕροι⟩ παρ' αὐτῷ σχήματα προσώπων τε ἀποστροφαῖς καὶ χρόνων ἐναλλαγαῖς καὶ τροπικῶν[1] σημειώσεων μεταφοραῖς ἐξηλλαγμένα τῶν συνήθων καὶ σολοικισμῶν λαμβάνοντα φαντασίας· ὁπόσα τε γίγνεται πράγματα ἀντὶ σωμάτων ἢ σώματα ἀντὶ πραγμάτων· καὶ ἐφ' ὧν ἐνθυμημάτων ⟨τε καὶ νοημάτων⟩ αἱ μεταξὺ παρεμπτώσεις πολλαὶ γινόμεναι διὰ πολλοῦ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν κομίζονται· τά τε σκολιὰ καὶ πολύπλοκα καὶ δυσεξέλικτα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ συγγενῆ τούτοις. εὕροι δ' ἄν τις οὐκ ὀλίγα καὶ τῶν θεατρικῶν σχημάτων κείμενα παρ' αὐτῷ, τὰς παρισώσεις λέγω ⟨καὶ παρομοιώσεις⟩ καὶ παρονομασίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις, ἐν αἷς ἐπλεόνασε Γοργίας ὁ Λεοντῖνος καὶ οἱ περὶ Πῶλον καὶ Λικύμνιον καὶ πολλοὶ ἄλλοι τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἀκμασάντων. ἐκδηλότατα δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ χαρακτηρικώτατά ἐστι τό τε πειρᾶσθαι δι' ἐλαχίστων ὀνομάτων πλεῖστα σημαί-

[1] τροπικῶν Krüger: τοπικῶν codd.

interchanging common with proper nouns, and active with passive verbs. He alters the natural uses of singular and plural, and substitutes the one for the other. He combines masculines with feminines, feminines with masculines, sometimes neuters with both, thereby violating the natural agreement of gender. He sometimes changes the case of nouns or participles from subject to object, and sometimes from object to subject. In the use of conjunctions and prepositions, and especially in his use of particles which serve to bring out the force of individual words, he allows himself full poetic licence. One can find in his work a great many constructions which, through changes of person and variation of tense,[1] and through the use of obscure, figurative expressions, acquire the appearance of solecisms. Again, he often substitutes things for persons and persons for things. In his arguments ⟨and his sentences⟩ there are often parentheses which delay the conclusion for a long time; and his style is generally tortuous, involved, difficult to unravel, and has other similar properties. The ostentatious figures of speech are also to be found in his work in no small number—I mean those parallelisms in length and sound, word-play and antithesis, which were excessively used by Gorgias of Leontini, by Polus and Lycymnius [2] and their followers, and by many of his other contemporaries. But the most obvious of his characteristics is the effort to express as much as possible in the fewest possible

[1] For an exhaustive modern treatment of this feature of Thucydides's style, see J. Ros, *Die μεταβολή als Stilprinzip des Thukydides*.

[2] See note 1, p. 137.

νειν πράγματα καὶ πολλὰ συντιθέναι νοήματα εἰς ἕν, καὶ ἔτι προσδεχόμενόν τι τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἀκούσεσθαι καταλείπειν· [1] ὑφ' ὧν ἀσαφὲς γίνεται τὸ βραχύ. ἵνα δὲ συνελὼν εἴπω, τέτταρα μέν ἐστιν ὥσπερ ὄργανα τῆς Θουκυδίδου λέξεως· τὸ ποιητικὸν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τὸ πολυειδὲς τῶν σχημάτων, τὸ τραχὺ τῆς ἁρμονίας, τὸ τάχος τῶν σημασιῶν· χρώματα δὲ αὐτῆς τό τε στριφνὸν καὶ τὸ πυκνόν, καὶ τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ αὐστηρόν, καὶ τὸ ἐμβριθὲς καὶ τὸ δεινὸν καὶ (τὸ) φοβερόν, ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα δὲ ταῦτα τὸ παθητικόν. τοιοῦτος μὲν δή τίς ἐστιν ὁ Θουκυδίδης κατὰ τὸν τῆς λέξεως χαρακτῆρα, ᾧ παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους διήνεγκεν. ὅταν μὲν οὖν ἥ τε προαίρεσις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ δύναμις συνεκδράμῃ, τέλεια γίνεται κατορθώματα καὶ δαιμόνια· ὅταν δὲ ἐλλείπῃ τὸ τῆς δυνάμεως, οὐ παραμείναντος μέχρι πάντων τοῦ τόνου, διὰ τὸ τάχος τῆς ἀπαγγελίας ἀσαφής τε ἡ λέξις γίνεται καὶ ἄλλας τινὰς ἐπιφέρει κῆρας οὐκ εὐπρεπεῖς. τὸ γὰρ ἐν ᾧ δεῖ τρόπῳ τὰ ξένα καὶ πεποιημένα λέγεσθαι καὶ μέχρι πόσου προελθόντα πεπαῦσθαι, καλὰ καὶ ἀναγκαῖα θεωρήματα ἐν πᾶσιν ὄντα τοῖς ἔργοις, οὐ διὰ πάσης τῆς ἱστορίας φυλάττει.

25 Προειρημένων δὲ τούτων κεφαλαιωδῶς ἐπὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις αὐτῶν ὥρα τρέπεσθαι. ποιήσομαι δὲ οὐ χωρὶς ὑπὲρ ἑκάστης ἰδέας τὸν λόγον, ὑποτάττων αὐταῖς τὴν Θουκυδίδου λέξιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ περιοχάς τινας καὶ τόπους, μέρη λαμβάνων τῆς τε διηγήσεως καὶ τῶν ῥητορειῶν καὶ παρατιθεὶς τοῖς τε πραγματικοῖς καὶ τοῖς λεκτικοῖς κατορθώμασιν ἢ ἁμαρτήμασι τὰς αἰτίας, δι' ἃς τοιαῦτά ἐστι· δεηθεὶς σοῦ

words, and to combine many ideas into one, and to leave the listener still expecting to hear something more. These help to make his brevity obscure. I may summarise the instruments, so to speak, of Thucydides's style as follows: there are four—artificiality of vocabulary, variety of figures, harshness of word-order, rapidity of signification. The special features of his style include compactness and solidity, pungency and severity, vehemence, the ability to disturb and terrify and above all emotional power. Such are the characteristics of style by which Thucydides is distinguished from all the rest. When his purpose coincides with his special talent, he is completely and marvellously successful; but when his power is not being employed to its full capacity and his energy flags before his goal is reached, the speed with which the ideas are presented renders the passage obscure, and brings in its train certain other unattractive faults. These include a failure to observe throughout the whole of his history in what way strange and artificial language should be used, and how far he should go before stopping, although these are worthy, indeed necessary subjects for all literary artists to study.

After those brief introductory remarks, it is time to 25
turn to detailed proof. I shall not deal with each aspect of his style separately, subjoining an illustrative passage from Thucydides, but shall treat the subject under general headings and topics, taking sections of narrative and rhetorical passages, and setting out the reasons for his success or failure in style or subject-matter. I once again beg you, and

[1] καταλείπειν Reiske: καταλιπεῖν codd.

πάλιν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φιλολόγων τῶν ἐντευξομένων τῇ γραφῇ, τὸ βούλημά μου τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἧς προῄρημαι σκοπεῖν, ὅτι χαρακτῆρός ἐστι δήλωσις ἅπαντα περιειληφυῖα τὰ συμβεβηκότα αὐτῷ καὶ δεόμενα λόγου, σκοπὸν ἔχουσα τὴν ὠφέλειαν αὐτῶν τῶν βουλησομένων μιμεῖσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα.

Ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προοιμίου προθέσει χρησάμενος, ὅτι μέγιστος ἐγένετο τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πολέμων ὁ Πελοποννησιακός, κατὰ λέξιν οὕτω γράφει· " τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ἔτι παλαιότερα σαφῶς μὲν εὑρεῖν διὰ χρόνου πλῆθος ἀδύνατον ἦν· ἐκ δὲ τεκμηρίων, ὧν ἐπὶ μακρότατον σκοποῦντί μοι ξυνέβη πιστεῦσαι, οὐ μεγάλα νομίζω γενέσθαι οὔτε κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους οὔτε εἰς τὰ ἄλλα. φαίνεται γὰρ ἡ νῦν Ἑλλὰς καλουμένη οὐ πάλαι βεβαίως οἰκουμένη, ἀλλὰ μεταναστάσεις τε οὖσαι τὰ πρότερα καὶ ῥᾳδίως ἕκαστοι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀπολείποντες, βιαζόμενοι ὑπό τινων αἰεὶ πλειόνων. τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὔσης, οὐδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις οὔτε κατὰ γῆν οὔτε διὰ θαλάσσης, νεμόμενοί τε τὰ αὑτῶν ἕκαστοι, ὅσον ἀποζῆν, καὶ περιουσίαν χρημάτων οὐκ ἔχοντες οὐδὲ γῆν φυ⟨τεύοντες⟩ . . . . . [1]

. . ⟨γνώ⟩μῃ δεδουλωμένοι ὡς ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους. καταφρονήσαντες οὖν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐμβοήσαντες ἀθρόοι ὥρμησαν ἐπ' αὐτούς." ἣδ' ἡ περιοχὴ ὤφελε μὲν κατεσκευάσθαι μὴ τοῦτον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλὰ κοινότερον μᾶλλον καὶ ὠφελιμώ-

[1] lacuna ex Thucydide explenda.

[1] i. 1. 3 ff.

any other scholar who should happen to read this treatise, to observe the purpose of the investigation I have chosen to carry out: it is to reveal his peculiar character, including all the noteworthy qualities that are to be found in his style. My aim in so doing is to assist those who may actually wish to imitate him.

He begins his introduction with the proposition that the Peloponnesian War was the greatest up to his time. His words are as follows:[1]

"Although the events that preceded this, and those of remoter antiquity could not, through the length of time, be ascertained clearly, yet from such evidence as I am disposed, through research which has followed events as far back as possible, to trust, I conclude that they were not great either with regard to wars or anything else. For instance, it is evident that the country which is now called Greece was not regularly settled in ancient times. The people were migratory in those days and readily left their dwelling-places whenever they were forced to by more numerous invaders. There was no commerce, and no safe communication between them by land or sea. The several tribes occupied their own territory, living at subsistence level, neither accumulating reserves of wealth nor cultivating the land. . . ."

(*a lacuna of some length*)

". . . intimidated at the prospect of facing the Lacedaemonians. Consequently they despised them, and with a shout rushed on them all at once."[2]

This group of events should not have been arranged thus, but in a more normal and helpful way, making

[2] iv. 34. 1.

τερον, τοῦ τελευταίου μορίου τῷ πρώτῳ προστεθέντος, τῶν δὲ διὰ μέσου τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα χώραν λαβόντων. ἀγκυλωτέρα μὲν οὖν ἡ φράσις οὕτω σχηματισθεῖσα γέγονε καὶ δεινοτέρα, σαφεστέρα δὲ καὶ ἡδίων ἐκείνως ἂν κατασκευασθεῖσα· "Τῶν δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων οὐκέτι ἐπεκθεῖν, ἢ προσπίπτοιεν, δυναμένων, γνόντες αὐτοὺς οἱ ψιλοὶ βραδυτέρους ἤδη, συστραφέντες καὶ ἐμβοήσαντες, ὥρμησαν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀθρόοι· ἔκ τε τῆς ὄψεως τὸ θαρρεῖν προσειληφότες, ὅτι πολλαπλάσιοι ἦσαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μηκέτι δεινοὺς αὐτοὺς ὁμοίως σφίσι φαίνεσθαι καταφρονήσαντες, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ εὐθὺς ἄξια τῆς προσδοκίας ἐπεπόνθεσαν, ἣν ἔσχον ὑπόληψιν, ὅτε πρῶτον ἀπέβαινον τῇ γνώμῃ δεδουλωμένοι ὡς
26 ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους." ὑπεξαιρουμένης δὲ τῆς περιγραφῆς πάσης, τἆλλα πάντα ὠνόμασταί τε τοῖς προσφυεστάτοις ὀνόμασι καὶ περιείληπται τοῖς ἐπιτηδειοτάτοις σχηματισμοῖς, ἀρετῆς τε οὐδεμιᾶς ὡς εἰπεῖν οὔτε λεκτικῆς οὔτε πραγματικῆς ἐνδεῶς ἔσχηκεν· ἃς οὐδὲν δέομαι πάλιν ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι.

Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ βύβλῳ τὴν ἐσχάτην ναυμαχίαν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Συρακοσίων ἀφηγούμενος οὕτως ὠνόμακέ τε καὶ ἐσχημάτικε τὰ πραχθέντα· "ὁ δὲ Δημοσθένης καὶ Μένανδρος καὶ Εὐθύδημος (οὗτοι γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοὶ ἐπέβησαν) ἅραντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν στρατοπέδου εὐθὺς ἔπλεον πρὸς τὸ ζεῦγμα τοῦ λιμένος καὶ τὸν παραλειφθέντα διέκπλουν, βουλόμενοι βιάσασθαι ἐς τὸ ἔξω. προεξαναγόμενοι δὲ οἱ Συρακόσιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι ναυσὶ παραπλησίαις τὸν ἀριθμὸν καὶ

the final part follow upon the first, with the intervening parts coming after these. Thucydides's arrangement has produced a more compact and striking sentence, but it would have been clearer and more pleasing if it had been arranged thus:

"When the Lacedaemonians were no longer able to rush out upon their assailants, the skirmishers, sensing that they were already slower in their movements, rallied and with a shout rushed upon them all at once. They had gained encouragement from seeing their own great superiority in numbers; and because the enemy no longer seemed so formidable, they came to despise them, because they had not at once sustained the losses they had expected, and which they had assumed they would suffer as they first disembarked, when they were intimidated at the prospect of facing the Lacedaemonians."

Thus all circuitous structure is entirely removed, and everything that is left is given its most natural name and is expressed in the most suitable figures. There is virtually no quality either of style or of content in which it is deficient; and there is no need for me to enumerate these again.

In his narrative of the final naval battle between the Athenians and the Syracusans in the seventh book, he 413 B.C. combines plain and figurative language as he describes the action thus:[1]

"Demosthenes, Menander and Euthydemus, who took the command on board, put out from their own camp and sailed straight to the barrier across the mouth of the harbour and to the passage left open, to try to force their way out. But the Syracusans and their allies had already put out with about the same

[1] vii. 69. 4–72. 1.

πρότερον κατά τε τὸν ἔκπλουν μέρει αὐτῶν ἐφύλασσον καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἄλλον κύκλῳ λιμένα, ὅπως πανταχόθεν ἅμα προσπίπτοιεν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις· καὶ ὁ πεζὸς αὐτοῖς ἅμα παρεβοήθει, ἧπερ καὶ αἱ νῆες κατίσχυον. ἦρχον δὲ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ τοῖς Συρακοσίοις Σικανὸς μὲν καὶ Ἀγάθαρχος, κέρας ἑκάτερος τοῦ παντὸς ἔχων, Πυθὴν δὲ καὶ οἱ Κορίνθιοι τὸ μέσον. ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἀθηναῖοι προσέμισγον τῷ ζεύγματι, τῇ μὲν πρώτῃ ῥύμῃ ἐπιπλέοντες ἐκράτουν τῶν τεταγμένων νεῶν πρὸς αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπειρῶντο λύειν τὰς κλείσεις· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο πανταχόθεν σφίσι τῶν Συρακοσίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἐπιφερομένων οὐ μόνον πρὸς τῷ ζεύγματι ἡ ναυμαχία, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὸν λιμένα ἐγίγνετο· καὶ ἦν καρτερὰ καὶ οἵα οὐχ ἑτέρα τῶν πρότερον. πολλὴ μὲν γὰρ ἑκατέροις προθυμία ἀπὸ τῶν ναυτῶν ἐς τὸ ἐπιπλεῖν, ὁπότε κελευσθείη, ἐγίγνετο, πολλὴ δ' ἡ ἀντιτέχνησις τῶν κυβερνητῶν καὶ ἀγωνισμὸς πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οἵ τε ἐπιβάται ἐθεράπευον, ὅτε προσπέσοι ναῦς νηί, μὴ λείπεσθαι τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ καταστρώματος τῆς ἄλλης τέχνης, πᾶς τέ τις ἐν ᾧ προσετέτακτο αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἠπείγετο πρῶτος φαίνεσθαι. ξυμπεσουσῶν δ' ἐν ὀλίγῳ πολλῶν νεῶν (πλεῖσται γὰρ δὴ αὗται ἐν ὀλίγῳ ἐναυμάχησαν· βραχὺ γὰρ ἀπέλιπον ξυναμφότεραι διακόσιαι γενέσθαι) αἱ μὲν ἐκβολαὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι τὰς ἀνακρούσεις καὶ διέκπλους ὀλίγαι ἐγίγνοντο· αἱ δὲ προσβολαί, ὡς τύχοι ναῦς νηὶ προσπεσοῦσα ἢ διὰ τὸ φυγεῖν ἢ ἄλλῃ ἐπιπλέουσι, πυκνότεραι ἦσαν. καὶ ὅσον μὲν χρόνον προσφέροιτο ναῦς, οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν κατα-

number of ships as before, a part of which kept guard at the outlet, the remainder all round the rest of the harbour, in order to attack the Athenians on all sides at once; while the land forces held themselves in readiness at the points where the ships preponderated. The Syracusan fleet was commanded by Sicanus and Agatharchus, who each had a wing of the whole force, with Pythen and the Corinthians in the centre. When the rest of the Athenians came up to the barrier, with the first shock of their charge they overpowered the ships stationed there, and tried to undo the fastenings; after this, as the Syracusans and their allies bore down upon them from all quarters, the battle spread from the barrier over the whole harbour, and was more determinedly fought than any of the preceding ones.

"On either side the rowers showed great zeal in bringing up their vessels at the boatswain's orders, and the helmsmen showed great skill in counter-manoeuvring, and great rivalry with one another; and when the ships were along side one another, the soldiers did their best not to let their performance on deck be outdone by the skill of the other service; in short, every man strove to prove himself the first in his particular department. And since many ships were engaged in a small compass (for these were the largest fleets engaging in the narrowest space ever known, being altogether little short of two hundred), the regular attacks with the beak were few, there being no opportunity of backing water or of breaking the line; while the collisions caused by one ship fouling upon another, in trying either to evade or to attack a third, were more frequent. So long as a vessel was coming up to the charge the men on the decks rained

στρωμάτων τοῖς ἀκοντίοις καὶ τοξεύμασι καὶ λίθοις ἀφθόνοις ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐχρῶντο· ἐπειδὴ δὲ προσμίξειαν, οἱ ἐπιβάται εἰς χεῖρας ἰόντες ἐπειρῶντο ταῖς ἀλλήλων ναυσὶν ἐπιβαίνειν. συνετύγχανέ τε πολλαχοῦ διὰ τὴν στενοχωρίαν τὰ μὲν ἄλλοις ἐμβεβληκέναι, τὰ δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐμβεβλῆσθαι, δύο τε περὶ μίαν καὶ ἔστιν ἣ καὶ πλείους ναῦς κατ' ἀνάγκην ξυνηρτῆσθαι· καὶ τοῖς κυβερνήταις τῶν μὲν φυλακήν, τῶν δ' ἐπιβουλὴν μὴ καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον, κατὰ πολλὰ δὲ πανταχόθεν περιεστάναι, καὶ τὸν κτύπον μέγαν ἀπὸ πολλῶν νεῶν συμπιπτουσῶν, ἔκπληξίν τε ἅμα καὶ ἀποστέρησιν τῆς ἀκοῆς ὧν οἱ κελευσταὶ ἐφθέγγοντο παρέχειν. πολλὴ γὰρ ἑτέρα ἡ παρακέλευσις καὶ ἡ βοὴ ἀφ' ἑκατέρων τοῖς κελευσταῖς κατά τε τὴν τέχνην καὶ πρὸς τὴν ναυτικὴν φιλονεικίαν ἐγίγνετο· τοῖς μὲν Ἀθηναίοις βιάζεσθαί τε τὸν ἔκπλουν ἐπιβοῶντες, καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐς τὴν πατρίδα σωτηρίας νῦν, εἴ ποτε, προθύμως ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι· τοῖς δὲ Συρακοσίοις καὶ ξυμμάχοις καλὸν εἶναι κωλῦσαί τε αὐτοὺς διαφυγεῖν, καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ἑκάστους πατρίδα νικήσαντας ἐπαυξῆσαι· καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ προσέτι ἑκατέρων, εἴ τινά που ὁρῷεν μὴ κατ' ἀνάγκην πρύμναν κρουόμενον ἀνακαλοῦντες ὀνομαστὶ τὸν τριήραρχον ἠρώτων, οἱ μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι, εἰ τὴν πολεμιωτάτην γῆν οἰκειοτέραν ἤδη τῆς οὐ δι' ὀλίγου πόνου ἐκτημένης θαλάσσης ἡγούμενοι ἀποχωροῦσιν· οἱ δὲ Συρακόσιοι, εἰ οὓς σαφῶς ἴσασι προθυμουμένους Ἀθηναίους παντὶ τρόπῳ διαφυγεῖν, τούτους αὐτοὶ φεύγοντας φεύγουσιν.

spears and arrows and stones upon her; but once along side, the heavy infantry tried to board each other's ships, fighting hand to hand. In many cases also it happened, because of the narrow space, that a ship was charging an enemy on one side and being charged herself on another, and that two and sometimes more ships had unavoidably become entangled around one, making the helmsman attend to defence here, offence there, not to one thing at a time, but to many on all sides; while the great din caused by the number of ships clashing together not only spread terror, but made the orders of the boatswains inaudible. The orders and appeals which the boatswains on either side shouted incessantly, in the discharge of their duty and in the heat of the naval conflict were different: the Athenians they urged to force the passage out, and now if ever to show their zeal and lay hold of a safe return to their country; to the Syracusans and their allies they cried that it would be glorious to prevent the escape of the enemy, and, conquering, to exalt the countries that were theirs. The generals, moreover, on either side, if they saw any in any part of the battle backing water without being forced to do so, called out to the trierarch by name and asked him, if they were Athenians, whether they were retreating because they thought the totally hostile shore more their own now than that sea which had cost them so much labour to win; and if they were Syracusans, whether they were flying from the flying Athenians, whom they well knew to be eager to escape in whatever way they could.

ὅ τ' ἐκ τῆς γῆς πεζὸς ἀμφοτέρων ἰσορρόπου τῆς ναυμαχίας καθεστηκυίας πολὺν τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ ξύστασιν τῆς γνώμης εἶχε, φιλονεικῶν μὲν ὁ αὐτόθεν περὶ τοῦ πλείονος ἤδη καλοῦ, δεδιότες δὲ οἱ ἐπελθόντες, μὴ τῶν παρόντων ἔτι χείρω πράξωσι. πάντων γὰρ δὴ ἀνακειμένων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐς τὰς ναῦς ὅ τε φόβος ἦν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος οὐδενὶ ἐοικὼς καὶ διὰ τὸ ἀνώμαλον καὶ τὴν ἔποψιν τῆς ναυμαχίας ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἠναγκάζοντο ἔχειν· δι' ὀλίγου γὰρ οὔσης τῆς θέας καὶ οὐ πάντων ἅμα ἐς τὸ αὐτὸ σκοπούντων, εἰ μέν τινες ἴδοιέν πῃ τοὺς σφετέρους ἐπικρατοῦντας, ἀνεθάρσησάν τε ἂν καὶ πρὸς ἀνάκλησιν θεῶν μὴ στερῆσαι σφᾶς τῆς σωτηρίας ἐτρέποντο· οἳ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ἡσσώμενον βλέψαντες ὀλοφυρμῷ τε ἅμα μετὰ βοῆς ἐχρῶντο καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δρωμένων τῆς ὄψεως καὶ τὴν γνώμην μᾶλλον τῶν ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ἐδουλοῦντο· ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀντίπαλόν τι τῆς ναυμαχίας ἀπιδόντες διὰ τὸ ἀκρίτως ξυνεχὲς τῆς ἁμίλλης καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν αὐτοῖς ἴσα τῇ δόξῃ περιδεῶς ξυναπονεύοντες ἐν τοῖς χαλεπώτατα διῆγον· ἀεὶ γὰρ παρ' ὀλίγον ἢ διέφευγον ἢ ἀπώλλυντο. ἦν τε ἐν τῷ στρατεύματι τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἕως ἀγχώμαλα ἐναυμάχουν, πάντα ὁμοῦ ἀκοῦσαι, ὀλοφυρμὸς βοή, νικῶντες κρατούμενοι, ἄλλα ὅσα ἐν μεγάλῳ κινδύνῳ μέγα στρατόπεδον πολυειδῆ ἀναγκάζοιτο φθέγγεσθαι. παραπλήσια δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν αὐτοῖς ἔπασχον, πρίν γε δὴ οἱ Συρακόσιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι, ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀντισχούσης τῆς ναυμαχίας, ἔτρεψάν τε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ ἐπικείμενοι λαμπρῶς, πολλῇ κραυγῇ καὶ διακελευσμῷ χρώμενοι, κατεδίωκον ἐς τὴν γῆν. τότε δὴ ὁ μὲν

" Meanwhile the two armies on shore, while victory hung in the balance, were a prey to the most agonising and conflicting emotions, the natives thirsting for more glory than they had already won, while the invaders feared to find themselves in an even worse plight than before. Since Athenian fortunes depended on their fleet, their fear for the outcome was like nothing they had ever felt; while their view from the land was necessarily as uneven as the battle itself. Close to the scene of the action and not all looking at the same point at once, some saw their friends victorious and took courage, and fell to calling upon heaven not to deprive them of salvation, while others who had their eyes turned upon the losers wailed and cried aloud, and as spectators of the action, were more overcome by emotion than the actual combatants. Others again were gazing at some spot where the battle was evenly disputed: as the strife was protracted without a decision, they suffered the worst agony of all as their bodies flinched in vicarious terror at what they saw, as safety and destruction were each a close matter. In short, in that one Athenian army, as long as the sea fight remained doubtful, there was every sound to be heard at once, shrieks, cries, " We win," " We lose," and all the other manifold exclamations that a great host would utter in a great peril.

" And with the men on the ships it was nearly the same, until at last the Syracusans and their allies, after the battle had lasted a long while, put the Athenians to flight, and with much shouting and cheering chased them in open rout to the shore. The

ναυτικὸς στρατὸς ἄλλος ἄλλῃ, ὅσοι μὴ μετέωροι ἑάλωσαν, κατενεχθέντες ἐξέπεσον ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον. ὁ δὲ πεζὸς οὐκέτι διαφόρως, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μιᾶς ὁρμῆς οἰμωγῇ τε καὶ στόνῳ πάντες δυσανασχετοῦντες τὰ γιγνόμενα, οἳ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς παρεβοήθουν, οἳ δὲ πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ τείχους ἐς φυλακήν· ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ οἱ πλεῖστοι ἤδη περὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς καὶ ὅπῃ σωθήσονται διεσκόπουν. ἦν τε ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα οὐδεμιᾶς δὴ τῶν ξυμπασῶν ἐλάσσων ἔκπληξις. παραπλήσιά τε ἐπεπόνθεσαν καὶ ἔδρασαν αὐτοὶ ἐν Πύλῳ· διαφθαρεισῶν γὰρ τῶν νεῶν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις προσαπώλλυντο αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἄνδρες διαβεβηκότες. καὶ τότε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἀνέλπιστον ἦν τὸ κατὰ γῆν σωθήσεσθαι, ἢν μή τι παρὰ λόγον γίγνηται. γενομένης δ' ἰσχυρᾶς τῆς ναυμαχίας καὶ πολλῶν νεῶν ἀμφοτέροις καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἀπολομένων οἱ Συρακόσιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἐπικρατήσαντες τά τε ναυάγια καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀνείλοντο καὶ ἀποπλεύσαντες πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τρόπαιον ἔστησαν."

27 Ἐμοὶ μὲν δὴ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια τούτοις ἄξια ζήλου τε καὶ μιμήσεως ἐφάνη, τήν τε μεγαληγορίαν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τὴν καλλιλογίαν καὶ τὴν δεινότητα καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετὰς ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπείσθην τελειοτάτας εἶναι, τεκμαιρόμενος, ὅτι πᾶσα ψυχὴ τούτῳ τῷ γένει τῆς λέξεως ἄγεται, καὶ οὔτε τὸ ἄλογον τῆς διανοίας κριτήριον, ᾧ πεφύκαμεν ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἡδέων ἢ ἀνιαρῶν, ἀλλοτριοῦται πρὸς αὐτὸ οὔτε τὸ λογικόν, ἐφ' οὗ διαγιγνώσκεται τὸ ἐν ἑκάστῃ τέχνῃ καλόν· οὐδ' ἂν ἔχοιεν οὔθ' οἱ μὴ πάνυ

naval force, one one way, one another, as many as were not taken afloat, now ran ashore and rushed from on board their ships to their camp; while the army, no more divided, but carried away by one impulse, all with shrieks and groans deplored the result, and ran down, some to help the ships, others to guard what was left of their wall, while the remaining and most numerous part already began to consider how they should save themselves. Indeed the panic of the present moment had never been surpassed. They now suffered very nearly what they had inflicted at 425 B.C. Pylos, as then the Lacedaemonians with the loss of their fleet lost also the men who had crossed over to the island, so now the Athenians had no hope of escaping by land without the help of some extraordinary chance. The sea fight having been a severe one, and many ships and lives having been lost on both sides, the victorious Syracusans and their allies now recovered their wrecks and their dead, sailed off to the city and set up a trophy."

This and narratives like it seemed to me admirable 27 and worthy of imitation, and I was convinced that in such passages as these we have perfect examples of the historian's sublime eloquence, the beauty of his language, his rhetorical brilliance and his other virtues. I was led to this conclusion when I observed that this style of writing appeals to all minds alike, since it offends neither our irrational aesthetic faculty, which is our natural instrument for distinguishing the pleasant from the distasteful, nor our reason, which enables us to judge individual technical excellence. Nobody, even the most inexperienced student of political oratory, could find a single objectionable word or figure of speech, nor could the most expert

λόγων ἔμπειροι πολιτικῶν εἰπεῖν, ἐφ' ὅτῳ δυσχεραίνουσιν ὀνόματι ἢ σχήματι, οὔθ' οἱ πάνυ περιττοὶ καὶ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ὑπερορῶντες ἀμαθίας μέμψασθαι τὴν κατασκευὴν ταύτης τῆς λέξεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ⟨τὸ⟩ τῶν ὀλίγων τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόληψιν ἔξει· ὁ μέν γε πολὺς ἐκεῖνος ἰδιώτης οὐ δυσχερανεῖ τὸ φορτικὸν τῆς λέξεως καὶ σκολιὸν καὶ δυσπαρακολούθητον· ὁ δὲ σπάνιος καὶ οὐδ' ἐκ τῆς ἐπιτυχούσης ἀγωγῆς γιγνόμενος τεχνίτης οὐ μέμψεται τὸ ἀγεννὲς καὶ χαμαιτυπὲς καὶ ἀκατάσκευον. ἀλλὰ συνῳδὸν ἔσται τό τε λογικὸν καὶ τὸ ἄλογον κριτήριον, ὑφ' ὧν ἀμφοτέρων ἀξιοῦμεν ἅπαντα κρίνεσθαι κατὰ τὰς τέχνας.

. . . . [1] ⟨ἐὰν δ'⟩ [2] . . . .

. . . . ἐργάσηται θάτερον, οὐκέτι καλὸν οὐδὲ
28 τέλειον ἀποδίδωσι τὸ ἕτερον. ἐγὼ γοῦν οὐκ ἔχω, πῶς ἐκεῖνα ἐπαινέσω τὰ δοκοῦντα μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ εἶναί τισιν, ὅσα μηδὲ τὰς πρώτας ἀρετὰς ἔχει καὶ κοινοτάτας, ἀλλ' ἐκνενίκηται τῷ περιέργῳ καὶ περιττῷ μήτε ἡδέα εἶναι μήτε ὠφέλιμα· ὧν ὀλίγα παρέξομαι δείγματα παρατιθεὶς εὐθὺς ἑκάστοις τὰς αἰτίας, δι' ἃς περιέστηκεν εἰς τὰς ἐναντίας ταῖς ἀρεταῖς κακίας. ἐν μὲν οὖν τῇ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ τὰ περὶ Κέρκυραν ὠμὰ καὶ ἀνόσια ἔργα διὰ τὴν στάσιν εἰς τοὺς δυνατωτάτους ἐκ τοῦ δήμου γενόμενα διεξιών, ἕως μὲν ἐν τῷ κοινῷ καὶ συνήθει τῆς διαλέκτου τρόπῳ τὰ πραχθέντα δηλοῖ, σαφῶς τε καὶ συντόμως καὶ δυνατῶς ἅπαντα εἴρηκεν· ἀρξάμενος δὲ ἐπιτραγῳδεῖν τὰς κοινὰς τῶν Ἑλλήνων συμφορὰς καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἐξαλλάττειν ἐκ τῶν ἐν ἔθει μακρῷ τινι

critic with the utmost contempt for the ignorance of the masses find fault with the style of this passage: the taste of the untutored majority and that of the educated few will be in agreement, for surely those laymen, and there are many of them, will find nothing base, tortuous or obscure to offend them, while the rare expert with his specialised training will find nothing ill-bred, humble or uncultivated. But reason and instinct will combine in one voice; and these are the two faculties with which we properly judge all works of art.

(*Lacuna*)

. . . ⟨but if one quality is developed to excess⟩, it destroys the nobility and perfection of the other.

Indeed, I cannot bring myself to praise those pas- 28
sages which some people find great and admirable, when they do not have even the essential and ordinary virtues, but have been forced to become neither agreeable nor instructive through being laboured and inflated. I shall illustrate this with a few examples, setting out directly beside them the reasons why virtues have given way to corresponding vices. In the third book, when he is describing the Corcyrean revolution and the inhuman atrocities committed against the leading democrats, so long as he tells the story in normal, familiar language, he says everything clearly, concisely and forcefully. But when he begins to dramatise the sufferings of the Greeks in general, and to divert his thoughts from its

[1] lacunam indicavit Sylburg.
[2] ἐὰν δ' supplevi.

γίγνεται χείρων αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ. ἔστι δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα, ὧν οὐδεὶς ἂν ὡς ἡμαρτημένων ἐπιλάβοιτο, ταῦτα· " Κερκυραῖοι δὲ αἰσθόμενοι τάς τε Ἀττικὰς ναῦς προσπλεούσας τάς τε τῶν πολεμίων οἰχομένας λαβόντες τοὺς Μεσσηνίους εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἤγαγον πρότερον ἔξω ὄντας, καὶ τὰς ναῦς περιπλεῦσαι κελεύσαντες, ἃς ἐπλήρωσαν, ἐς τὸν Ὑλαϊκὸν λιμένα, ἐν ὅσῳ περιεκομίζοντο, τῶν ἐχθρῶν εἴ τινα λάβοιεν ἀπέκτεινον, καὶ ἐκ τῶν νεῶν ὅσους ἔπεισαν εἰσβῆναι ἐκβιβάζοντες ἀνεχρῶντο· εἰς τὸ Ἡραιόν τε ἐλθόντες, τῶν ἱκετῶν ὡς πεντήκοντα ἄνδρας δίκην ὑποσχεῖν ἔπεισαν καὶ κατέγνωσαν ἁπάντων θάνατον· οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν ἱκετῶν, ὅσοι οὐκ ἐπείσθησαν, ὡς ἑώρων τὰ γιγνόμενα, διέφθειρον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐκ τῶν δένδρων τινὲς ἀπήγχοντο, οἳ δ' ὡς ἕκαστοι ἐδύναντο ἀνηλοῦντο. ἡμέρας τε ἑπτά, ἃς ἀφικόμενος ὁ Εὐρυμέδων ταῖς ἑξήκοντα ναυσὶ παρέμεινε, Κερκυραῖοι σφῶν αὐτῶν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς δοκοῦντας εἶναι ἐφόνευον, τὴν μὲν αἰτίαν ἐπιφέροντες τοῖς τὸν δῆμον καταλύουσιν· ἀπέθανον δέ τινες καὶ ἰδίας ἔχθρας ἕνεκα, καὶ ἄλλοι χρημάτων σφίσιν ὀφειλομένων ὑπὸ τῶν λαβόντων. πᾶσά τε ἰδέα κατέστη θανάτου, καὶ οἷον φιλεῖ ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ γίγνεσθαι, οὐδὲν ὅ τι οὐ ξυνέβη, καὶ ἔτι περαιτέρω· καὶ γὰρ πατὴρ παῖδα ἀπέκτεινε, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀπεσπῶντο καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῖς ἐκτείνοντο, οἳ δέ τινες καὶ περιοικοδομηθέντες ἐν τοῦ Διονύσου τῷ ἱερῷ ἀπέθανον. οὕτως ὠμὴ στάσις προὐχώρησε,

[1] iii. 81. 2–82. 1.

accustomed channels, he falls far below his own standards. The opening sentences, with which nobody would find fault, are as follows:[1]

"The Corcyreans, learning that the Athenian ships were approaching and those of the enemy had withdrawn, brought the Messenians from outside the walls into the town, and ordered the ships which they had manned to sail round into the Hyllaic harbour, and while it was doing so killed whatever enemies they had captured, despatching afterwards as they landed them those whom they had persuaded to go on board the ships. Next they went to the sanctuary of Hera and persuaded about fifty men to stand trial, and condemned them all to death. The majority of the suppliants who had refused to do so, on seeing what was happening, killed each other there in the consecrated ground, while some hanged themselves upon the trees, and others destroyed themselves as they were severally able. For the seven days that Eurymedon stayed with his sixty ships, the Corcyreans were engaged with his sixty ships, the Corcyreans were engaged in butchering those of their fellow-citizens whom they regarded as their enemies; and although the crime of which they were accused was that of attempting to put down the democracy, some were slain also for private enmity, others by their debtors because of money owed to them. Thus death raged in every form; and, as usually happens at such times, there was no length to which violence did not go, and even further than this: sons were killed by their fathers, and suppliants dragged from the altar or slain upon it; while some were even immured in the temple of Dionysus and died there. Such was the cruelty with which the revolution followed its course, and it seemed the more cruel because

καὶ ἔδοξε μᾶλλον, διότι ἐν τοῖς πρώτη ἐγένετο· ἐπεὶ ὕστερόν γε καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκινήθη, διαφορῶν ⟨οὐσῶν⟩ ἑκασταχοῦ τοῖς τε τῶν δήμων προστάταις τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπάγεσθαι καὶ τοῖς ὀλίγοις τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους."

29 ἃ δὲ τούτοις ἐπιφέρει, σκολιὰ καὶ δυσπαρακολούθητα καὶ τὰς τῶν σχηματισμῶν πλοκὰς σολοικοφανεῖς ἔχοντα καὶ οὔτε τοῖς κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν βίον γενομένοις ἐπιτηδευθέντα οὔτε τοῖς ὕστερον, ὅτε μάλιστα ἤκμασεν ἡ πολιτικὴ δύναμις· ἃ μέλλω νυνὶ λέγειν· "ἐστασίαζέν τε οὖν τὰ τῶν πόλεων, καὶ τὰ ἐφυστερίζοντά που ἐπιπύστει[1] τῶν προγενομένων πολὺ ἐπέφερε τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ καινοῦσθαι τὰς διανοίας τῶν τ' ἐπιχειρήσεων περιτεχνήσει καὶ τῶν τιμωριῶν ἀτοπίᾳ." ἐν τούτοις τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τῶν κώλων περιπέφρασται πρὸς οὐδὲν ἀναγκαῖον· "ἐστασίαζέ τε[2] οὖν τὰ τῶν πόλεων"· ὑγιέστερον γὰρ ἦν εἰπεῖν "ἐστασίαζον αἱ πόλεις." τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ λεγόμενον· "καὶ τὰ ἐφυστερίζοντά που" δυσείκαστόν ἐστι· σαφέστερον δ' ἂν ἐγένετο ῥηθὲν οὕτως· "αἱ δ' ὑστεροῦσαι πόλεις." οἷς ἐπίκειται· "ἐπιπύστει τῶν προγεγενημένων πολὺ ἐπέφερε τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ἐς τὸ καινοῦσθαι τὰς διανοίας"· βούλεται μὲν γὰρ λέγειν· "οἱ δὲ ὑστερίζοντες ἐπιπυνθανόμενοι τὰ γεγενημένα παρ' ἑτέροις ἐλάμβανον ὑπερβολὴν ἐπὶ τὸ διανοεῖσθαί τι καινότερον"· χωρὶς δὲ τῆς πλοκῆς οὐδὲ οἱ τῶν ὀνομάτων σχηματισμοὶ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς εἰσιν ἡδεῖς. τούτοις ἐπιφέρει κεφάλαιον

[1] ἐπιπύστει Reiske: ἐπὶ πύστει MP: πύστει Thuc.
[2] ἐστασίαζέ τε Sylburg: ἐστασιάζετο codd.

it was the first to occur. Later on, one may say, the whole Greek world was thrown into turmoil, as the partisans of democracy in each contending state tried to bring in the Athenians, and those of oligarchy the Spartans."

What he goes on to write, however, is tortuous and 29
difficult to follow, containing combinations of figures that verge upon solecism. Such a style was not employed either by his own or by succeeding generations, who wrote when politicians were at the height of their professional influence. I shall now quote the passage:[1]

"Revolution thus ran its course throughout the states, and those which experienced it later anywhere, having heard what had been done before, carried to a still greater excess the invention of new ideas through the elaborate ingenuity of their enterprises and the atrocity of their reprisals."

In the first of these clauses, the phrase "Revolution thus ran its course throughout the states" is an unnecessary periphrasis: it would have been sounder to write "The cities were in a state of revolution." The next expression, "those which experienced it later anywhere" is difficult to make out: it would have been clearer expressed thus: "the cities later affected." After that he writes: "having heard what had been done before, carried to a still greater excess the invention of new ideas." What he means to say is: "Later revolutionaries, hearing what had happened in other cities went to extremes in trying to devise something still more novel." In addition to the unhappy combination of figures, the use of substantival construction is not pleasing to the ear. This

[1] iii. 82. 3.

ἄλλο ποιητικῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ διθυραμβικῆς σκευωρίας οἰκειότερον· "τῶν τ' ἐπιχειρήσεων ἐπιτεχνήσει καὶ τῶν τιμωριῶν ἀτοπίᾳ· καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀξίωσιν ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιώσει." ὃ γὰρ βούλεται δηλοῦν ἐν τῇ δυσεξελίκτῳ πλοκῇ, τοιοῦτόν ἐστι· "πολλὴν τὴν ἐπίδοσιν ἐλάμβανον εἰς τὸ διανοεῖσθαί τι καινότερον περὶ τὰς τέχνας τῶν ἐγχειρημάτων καὶ περὶ τὰς ὑπερβολὰς τῶν τιμωριῶν· τά τε εἰωθότα ὀνόματα ἐπὶ τοῖς πράγμασι λέγεσθαι μετατιθέντες ἄλλως ἠξίουν αὐτὰ καλεῖν." ἡ δ' "ἐπιτέχνησις" καὶ ἡ "τῶν τιμωριῶν ἀτοπία" καὶ ἡ "εἰωθυῖα τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀξίωσις" καὶ ἡ "εἰς τὰ ἔργα ἀντηλλαγμένη δικαίωσις" περιφράσεως ποιητικῆς ἐστιν οἰκειοτέρα. οἷς ἐπιτίθησι τὰ θεατρικὰ σχήματα ταυτί· "τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀλόγιστος ἀνδρία φιλέταιρος ἐνομίσθη, μέλλησις δὲ προμηθὴς δειλία εὐπρεπής"· παρομοιώσεις γὰρ ἀμφότερα ταῦτα καὶ παρισώσεις περιέχει, καὶ τὰ ἐπίθετα καλλωπισμοῦ χάριν κεῖται· τὸ γὰρ οὔτε θεατρικὸν . .[1] ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον τῆς λέξεως σχῆμα τοιοῦτ' ἂν ἦν· "τὴν μὲν γὰρ τόλμαν ἀνδρίαν ἐκάλουν, τὴν δὲ μέλλησιν δειλίαν." ὅμοια δὲ τούτοις ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ συναπτόμενα· "τὸ δὲ σῶφρον τοῦ ἀνάνδρου πρόσχημα, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἅπαν συνετὸν ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀργόν"· κυριώτερον δ' ἂν οὕτως ἐλέχθη· "οἱ δὲ σώφρονες ἄνανδροι, καὶ οἱ συνετοὶ πρὸς ἅπαντα ἐν ἅπασιν ἀργοί."

30 εἰ μέχρι τούτων προελθὼν ἐπαύσατο τὰ μὲν καλλωπίζων, τὰ δὲ σκληραγωγῶν τὴν λέξιν, ἧττον ἂν ὀχληρὸς ἦν. νῦν δ' ἐπιτίθησιν· "ἀσφά-

clause is followed by another phrase which would be more at home in a poetical, or rather dithyrambic setting: "through the elaborate ingenuity of their enterprises and the atrocity of their reprisals; and they changed the normal meaning of words, as they thought fit, to suit their actions." By this inextricable combination what he is trying to convey is: "Men became much more interested in inventing new enterprises and in devising atrocity of reprisals; and they saw fit to substitute new names for the normal ones for these activities." "Ingenuity" and "atrocity" and "normal meaning of words" and "to suit their actions as they thought fit" are more suited to the circumlocutions of poetry. These are followed by the following pretentious figures: "Reckless bravado came to be regarded as the courage of a loyal ally; provident hesitation as specious cowardice." Both of these involve parallelism in sound and length, and the adjectives are included purely for the sake of decoration. The unpretentious, . . . way of putting it, framing the expression in essential terms, would have been: "Men called bravado courage, and hesitation cowardice." The sequel is in a similar vein: "moderation was a cloak for unmanliness, ability to understand all disinclination to act in any." A more direct way of saying this would have been: "moderate men were considered unmanly, and those able to understand everything passive in everything."

If he had not gone beyond this point with this 30
mixture of ornate and harsh expression, he would not have been so tiresome. But as it is he continues with

---

[1] lacunam indicavit Reiske.

λεια δὲ τὸ ἐπιβουλεύσασθαι, ἀποτροπῆς πρόφασις εὔλογος. καὶ ὁ μὲν χαλεπαίνων πιστὸς ἀεί, ὁ δ' ἀντιλέγων αὐτῷ ὕποπτος." καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις πάλιν ἄδηλον μέν ἐστι, τίνα βούλεται δηλοῦν τὸν χαλεπαίνοντα καὶ περὶ τίνος, τίνα δὲ τὸν ἀντιλέγοντα καὶ ἐφ' ὅτῳ. "ἐπιβουλεύσας δέ τις" φησί "τυχών τε ξυνετός, καὶ ὑπονοήσας ἔτι δεινότερος· προβουλεύσας δὲ ὅπως μηδὲν αὐτῷ δεήσει, τῆς ἑταιρίας διαλυτὴς καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐκπεπληγμένος." οὔτε γὰρ ὁ "τυχών" ἐμφαίνει μᾶλλον, ὃ βούλεται δηλοῦν, οὔτε ὁ αὐτὸς τυχών τε καὶ ὑπονοήσας ἅμα νοεῖσθαι δύναται, εἴ γε ὁ μὲν τυχὼν ἐπὶ τοῦ κατορθώσαντος καὶ ἐπιτυχόντος ὃ ἤλπισε λέγεται, ὁ δὲ ὑπονοήσας ἐπὶ τοῦ προαισθομένου τὸ μήπω πραχθὲν ἀλλ' ἔτι μέλλον [1] κακόν. καθαρὸς δὲ καὶ τηλαυγὴς ὁ νοῦς οὕτως ἂν ἦν· "οἵ τ' ἐπιβουλεύοντες ἑτέροις εἰ κατορθώσειαν, δεινοί· καὶ οἱ τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς προύπονοοῦντες [2] εἰ φυλάξαιντο, ἔτι δεινότεροι· ὁ δὲ προϊδόμενος, ὅπως μηδὲν αὐτῷ δεήσει μήτ' ἐπιβουλῆς μήτε φυλακῆς, τάς τε ἑταιρίας διαλύειν ἐδόκει καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐκπεπλῆχθαι."

31 μίαν δὲ τούτοις ἐπιθεὶς περίοδον ἀγκύλως εἰρημένην καὶ δυνατῶς μετὰ τοῦ σαφῶς· "ἁπλῶς δὲ ὁ φθάσας τὸν μέλλοντα κακόν τι δρᾶν ἐπῃνεῖτο καὶ ὁ ἐπικελεύσας τὸν μὴ διανοούμενον" ποιητικῇ

[1] μέλλον Reiske: μᾶλλον codd.
[2] προύπονοοῦντες Reiske: προεπινοοῦντες M.

[2] iii. 82. 5.
[3] iii. 82. 5.

these words:[1] "Plotting became a means of self-preservation, and a reasoned excuse for withdrawal. The advocate of extreme policies was always trusted, and his opponent suspected." Here again the identity of the "advocate of extreme policies" and his motives are obscure, as are those of "his opponent." Then he says:[2] "The successful conspirator was deemed clever, the man who disclosed a plot even more brilliant; but the man who planned to avoid needing either was accused of destroying his party and being afraid of his opponents." The word "successful" does not make any clearer what he wants to express; nor can the same person be conceived of as both "successful" and "disclosing a plot," assuming that "successful" is used of one who has successfully attained the object for which he hoped, and "disclosing a plot" is used of one who has anticipated an evil act which has not yet been perpetrated, but is still in the future. The sense would have been conspicuously clear if it had been rendered thus:

"Those who conspired against others were considered clever if they succeeded, those who foresaw conspiracies and guarded against them even cleverer; while the man who tried to ensure that he needed neither conspiracy nor protection against it was accused of destroying his party and being afraid of his opponents."

After adding one well-rounded sentence, in which 31
power is combined with clarity:[3] "In short, both the man who anticipated another in some evil and the man who suggested a crime to one who had no such idea were equally praised"; he will revert to poetic

[1] iii. 82. 4.

πάλιν χρήσεται μεταλήψει· "καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ συγγενὲς τοῦ ἑταιρικοῦ ἀλλοτριώτερον ἐγένετο διὰ τὸ ἑτοιμότερον εἶναι ἀπροφασίστως τολμᾶν." τὸ γὰρ "συγγενές" καὶ τὸ "ἑταιρικόν" ⟨ἀντὶ τῆς συγγενείας καὶ τῆς ἑταιρίας⟩[1] κείμενον μετείληπται· τό τε "ἀπροφασίστως τολμᾶν" ἄδηλον, εἴ τε ἐπὶ τῶν φίλων κεῖται νῦν εἴ τε ἐπὶ τῶν συγγενῶν. αἰτίαν γὰρ ἀποδιδοὺς, δι' ἣν τοὺς συγγενεῖς ἀλλοτριωτέρους ἔκρινον τῶν φίλων, ἐπιτίθησιν, ὅτι τόλμαν ἀπροφάσιστον παρείχοντο. σαφὴς δ' ἂν ἦν ⟨ὁ⟩[2] λόγος, εἰ τοῦτον ἐξήνεγκε τὸν τρόπον κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βούλησιν σχηματίζων· "καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ ἑταιρικὸν οἰκειότερον ἐγένετο τοῦ συγγενοῦς διὰ τὸ ἑτοιμότερον εἶναι ἀπροφασίστως τολμᾶν." περιπέφρασται δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τούτοις, καὶ οὔτε ἰσχυρῶς οὔτε σαφῶς ἀπήγγελται· "οὐ γὰρ μετὰ τῶν κειμένων νόμων ὠφελείας αἱ τοιαῦται σύνοδοι, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοὺς καθεστῶτας πλεονεξίᾳ." ὁ μὲν νοῦς ἐστὶ τοιόσδε· "οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ ταῖς κατὰ νόμον ὠφελείαις αἱ τῶν ἑταιριῶν ἐγίνοντο σύνοδοι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ παρὰ τοὺς νόμους τι πλεονεκτεῖν." "Καὶ ὅρκοι" φησίν "εἴ που ἄρα ἐγίγνοντο συναλλαγῆς, ἐν τῷ αὐτίκα πρὸς τὸ ἄπορον ⟨ἑκατέρῳ⟩[3] διδόμενοι ἴσχυον, οὐκ ἐχόντων ἄλλοθεν δύναμιν"· ἐν τούτοις ὑπέρβατόν τε καὶ περίφρασις· οἱ μὲν γὰρ "ὅρκοι τῆς συναλλαγῆς" τὸ σημαινόμενον ἔχουσι τοιοῦτον· "οἱ δὲ περὶ τῆς φιλίας ὅρκοι εἴ που ἄρα γένοιντο." τὸ δὲ "ἴσχυον" δι' ὑπερβατοῦ κείμενον τῷ "αὐτίκα"

[1] ἀντὶ τῆς συγγενείας καὶ τῆς ἑταιρίας supplevit Usener ex scholio. [2] ὁ inseruit Krüger.

artificiality: "Moreover, ties of kindred became less binding than partisan ties, because the latter induced a greater readiness for unstinted action." "Kindred" and "partisan" have been substituted for "kinship" and "party." It is uncertain whether the phrase "for unstinted action" is here applied to one's friends or to one's relatives; for to supply the reason why they thought their kinsmen were less closely attached to them than their friends, he adds "because they showed readiness for unstinted action." The argument would have been clear if he had expressed it in the following manner, using his chosen figure: "Again 'comradely' became more intimate than 'kindred,' owing to a greater readiness for unstinted action." What follows is also expressed in a circuitous way, and the description lacks both force and clarity: "For such associations are created not to benefit from the support of established laws, but to defy them and so win greater advantages. The sense of this is: "Political clubs were created not for mutual aid according to the laws, but to win greater advantages in defiance of them." "And," he says,[1] "oaths of reconciliation, in the few cases they were exchanged, held good only while immediate difficulties obtained and no other source offered support." This contains hyperbaton and periphrasis. "Oaths of reconciliation" means something like "oaths of friendship, in the few cases they were exchanged"; "held good" belongs with "immediate," though it is separated from it, for he is

[1] iii. 82. 7.

---

[3] ἑκατέρῳ Thuc.

ἔπεται, βούλεται γὰρ δηλοῦν "ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα ἴσχυον"· τὸ δὲ "πρὸς τὸ ἄπορον ἑκατέρῳ διδόμενοι, οὐκ ἐχόντων ἄλλοθεν δύναμιν" σαφέστερον ἂν ἦν οὕτως ἐξενεχθέν· "διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἄλλην ἔχειν δύναμιν κατὰ τὸ ἄπορον ἑκατέρῳ διδόμενοι." τὸ δὲ κατάλληλον τῆς διανοίας ἦν ἂν τοιοῦτο· "οἱ δὲ περὶ τῆς φιλίας ὅρκοι εἴ που ἄρα γένοιντο, ἀπορίᾳ πίστεως ἄλλης ἑκατέρῳ
32 διδόμενοι ἐν τῷ παραχρῆμα ἴσχυον." σκολιώτερα δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ καὶ ἃ μετὰ ταῦτα τίθησιν· "ἐν δὲ τῷ παρατυχόντι ὁ φθάσας θαρρῆσαι εἰ ἴδοι ἄφρακτον, ἥδιον διὰ τὴν πίστιν ἐτιμωρεῖτο ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφανοῦς· καὶ τό τε ἀσφαλὲς ἐλογίζετο, καὶ ὅτι ἀπάτῃ περιγενόμενος συνέσεως ἀγώνισμα προσελάμβανε"· τὸ δὴ "παρατυχόν" ἀντὶ τοῦ "παραχρῆμα" κεῖται, τό τε "ἄφρακτον" ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀφυλάκτου" καὶ τὸ "ἥδιον τιμωρεῖσθαι διὰ τὴν πίστιν μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφανοῦς" σκοτεινῶς περιπέφρασται, καὶ ἐλλείπει τι μόριον εἰς τὸ συμπληρωθῆναι τὴν νόησιν. εἰκάζειν δὲ ἔστιν, ὅτι τοῦτο βούλεται λέγειν· "εἰ δέ που παρατύχοι τινὶ καιρὸς καὶ μάθοι τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀφύλακτον, ἥδιον ἐτιμωρεῖτο, ὅτι πιστεύσαντι ἐπέθετο μᾶλλον ἢ φυλαττομένῳ· καὶ συνέσεως δόξαν προσελάμβανε, τό τε ἀσφαλὲς λογιζόμενος καὶ ὅτι διὰ

---

[1] iii. 82. 7.

trying to indicate that " they had held good for the time being." The expression " were exchanged . . . while immediate difficulties obtained and no other source offered support " would have been clearer rendered in this way: " The offer had been made by each side because it had no other source available on account of its difficulties." The sequence of thought would then have been like this: " Oaths of friendship, in the few cases they were exchanged, held good only temporarily, since the offer had been made by both sides only because of the lack of any other reliable source."

What he writes next is even more tortuous than 32
this:[1]

" But the man who dared to strike the first blow when opportunity offered and he saw his enemy unfortified, thought revenge thus gained to be sweeter than that won openly, because it involved betrayal of trust. He further considered both the safety of his action, and also that in overcoming his enemy by deceit he was gaining the additional prize of superior intelligence."

" Opportunity " is used instead of " right moment." " unfortified " instead of " unguarded "; and the phrase " sweeter to gain revenge by betrayal of trust than to win it openly " is an obscure circumlocution, needing a further part to complete its sense. We can guess that he wishes to say:

" If the right moment presented itself to anyone and he perceived that his enemy was off his guard, he took revenge with greater pleasure because the victim had trusted him than if he had been off his guard. He also earned the reputation of being intelligent, in that he had calculated the safety of his

τὴν ἀπάτην αὐτοῦ περιεγένετο." "ῥᾷον δ' οἱ πολλοὶ κακοῦργοι" φησίν "ὄντες δεξιοὶ κέκληνται ἢ ἀμαθεῖς ἀγαθοί, καὶ τῷ μὲν αἰσχύνονται, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἀγάλλονται"· ταῦτα γὰρ ἀγκύλως μὲν εἴρηται καὶ βραχέως, ἐν ἀφανεῖ δὲ κείμενον ἔχει τὸ σημαινόμενον. χαλεπὸν γὰρ μαθεῖν, τίνας δή ποτε νοεῖ τοὺς ἀμαθεῖς τε καὶ ἀγαθούς· εἴ τε γὰρ ἀντιδιαστέλλεται πρὸς τοὺς κακούργους, οὐκ ἂν εἴησαν ἀμαθεῖς οἱ μὴ κακοί· εἴ τ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ ἀφρόνων τίθησι τοὺς ἀμαθεῖς, κατὰ τί δή ποτε τούτους ἀγαθοὺς καλεῖ; "καὶ τῷ μὲν αἰσχύνονται" τίνες; ἄδηλον γὰρ πότερον ἀμφότεροι ἢ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς. "ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ἀγάλλονται" κἀνταῦθα ἄδηλον, τίνες· εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων τίθησιν, οὐκ ἔχει νοῦν· οὔτε γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς κακούργοις οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἀγάλλονται οὔτ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀμαθέσιν οἱ κακοῦργοι αἰσχύνονται.

33 Οὗτος ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ἀσαφοῦς καὶ πεπλεγμένης λέξεως, ἐν ᾗ πλείων ἔνεστι τῆς θέλξεως ἡ σκοτίζουσα τὴν διάνοιαν ὄχλησις, ἕως ἑκατὸν ἐκμηκύνεται στίχων. θήσω δὲ [1] καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς οὐδεμίαν ἔτι λέξιν ἐμαυτοῦ προστιθείς· "πάντων δ' αὐτῶν αἴτιον ἀρχὴ ἡ διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν, ἐκ δ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐς τὸ φιλονεικεῖν καθισταμένων τὸ πρόθυμον. οἱ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι προστάντες, μετὰ ὀνόματος ἑκάτεροι εὐπρεποῦς, πλήθους τε ἰσονομίας πολιτικῆς καὶ ἀριστοκρατίας σώφρονος

[1] δὲ Krüger: δὴ codd.

action, and because he had overcome his opponent by deceit."

Then he says:[1]

" And in most cases villains are more ready to be called adroit than are good men to be called stupid: in the latter case they are ashamed, but in the former they pride themselves."

This is compact and brief, but its meaning lies concealed: for it is difficult to understand who in the world are meant by the " stupid " and the " good " men. If he is contrasting them with the " villains," men who are not wicked cannot be simpletons; and if he applies the term " stupid " to the silly and the senseless, by what reasoning can he call such men " good "? And who are those " latter " who " are ashamed? " For it is not clear whether this refers to both classes of men or only the simple men. It is also not clear who " the former " who " pride themselves " are: if it is meant to apply to both, it does not make sense, since good men do not take pride in being villains, nor are villains ashamed of being stupid.

These are the characteristics of the obscure and involved style, which contains less charm than confusion to cloud the mind; and this passage goes on for a hundred lines. I shall quote the rest without any further comment of my own:[2] 33

" Now the cause of all these evils was the pursuit of power for the gratification of greed and ambition, and from these arose the lust for party faction once these parties became engaged in contention. The leaders in the cities, each professing an attractive policy—like the political equality of the people or

[1] iii. 82. 7.
[2] iii. 82. 8–83. 3.

προτιμήσει, τὰ μὲν κοινὰ λόγῳ θεραπεύοντες ἆθλα ἐποιοῦντο· παντὶ δὲ τρόπῳ ἀγωνιζόμενοι ἀλλήλων περιγενέσθαι ἐτόλμησάν τε τὰ δεινότατα, ἐπεξῆλθόν τε τὰς τιμωρίας ἔτι μείζους, οὐ μέχρι τοῦ δικαίου καὶ τῇ πόλει ξυμφόρου προστιθέντες, ἐς δὲ τὸ ἑκατέροις που αἰεὶ ἡδονὴν ἔχον ὁρίζοντες· καὶ ἢ μετὰ ψήφου ἀδίκου καταγνώσεως ἢ χειρὶ κτώμενοι τὸ κρατεῖν ἕτοιμοι ἦσαν τὴν αὐτίκα φιλονεικίαν ἐκπιμπλάναι. ὥστ' εὐσεβείᾳ μὲν οὐδέτεροι ἐνόμιζον, εὐπρεπείᾳ δὲ λόγου, οἷς ξυμβαίη ἐπιφθόνως τι διαπράξασθαι, ἄμεινον ἤκουον· τὰ δὲ μέσα τῶν πολιτῶν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων, ἢ ὅτι οὐ συνηγωνίζοντο ἢ ὅτι φθόνῳ τοῦ περιεῖναι, διεφθείροντο. οὕτω πᾶσα ἰδέα κατέστη κακοτροπίας διὰ τὰς στάσεις τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ· καὶ τὸ εὖηθες, οὗ τὸ γενναῖον πλεῖστον μετέχει, καταγελασθὲν ἠφανίσθη· τὸ δὲ ἀντιτετάχθαι ἀλλήλοις τῇ γνώμῃ ἀπίστως ἐπὶ πολὺ διήνεγκεν. οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὁ διαλύσων οὔτε λόγος ἐχυρὸς οὔτε ὅρκος φοβερός. κρείττους δὲ ὄντες πάντες λογισμῷ ἐς τὸ ἀνέλπιστον τοῦ βεβαίου μὴ παθεῖν μᾶλλον προεσκόπουν ἢ πιστεῦσαι ἐδύναντο. καὶ οἱ φαυλότεροι γνώμην ὡς τὰ πλείω περιεγίγνοντο. τῷ γὰρ δεδιέναι τό τε αὑτῶν ἐνδεὲς καὶ τὸ τῶν ἐναντίων ξυνετόν, μὴ λόγοις τε ἥττους ὦσι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πολυτρόπου αὐτῶν τῆς γνώμης φθάσωσι προεπιβουλευόμενοι, τολμηρῶς πρὸς τὰ ἔργα ἐχώρουν· οἱ δὲ καταφρονοῦντες

moderate aristocracy, sought prizes for themselves in those public interests which they pretended to cherish, used every available weapon in their struggle for supremacy over each other and dared to commit the most dreadful crimes, and carried their acts of vengeance to excess, not stopping at what justice and the good of the state demanded, but making the party caprice of the moment the only limit; and whether the victim had been secured by unjust condemnation or by main force, they were ready to glut the animosity they felt at the moment. Thus morality was in fashion with neither party; but the use of fair phrases earned a better reputation for those who had perpetrated some odious crime; and the citizens who stayed in the middle were destroyed by both sides, either because they did not join them in their struggle, or because of envy that they should survive.

"Thus every form of villainy arose in Greece from these revolutions. Simplicity, which is a very large part of the noble nature, was laughed down and disappeared; mutual antagonism gave rise to mistrust and divided most men from their neighbours. Neither was a man's word strong enough nor his oath, to be sufficiently respected to put an end to the dissension; but all parties' minds reckoned on the hopelessness of things rather than on their reliability, were more intent upon avoiding harm than capable of confidence. In this the inferior intellects had the advantage for the most part: apprehensive of their own deficiencies and of the cleverness of their opponents, they were afraid of being worsted in debate and of being anticipated in conspiracy by their more versatile antagonists, and hence resorted to bold action; while their adversaries, arrogantly thinking that they

κἂν προαισθέσθαι, καὶ ἔργῳ οὐδὲν σφᾶς δεῖν λαμβάνειν, ἃ γνώμῃ ἔξεστιν, ἄφρακτοι μᾶλλον διεφθείροντο." Ἐκ πολλῶν ἔτι δυνάμενος παραδειγμάτων ποιῆσαι φανερόν, ὅτι κρείττων ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς διηγήμασιν, ὅταν ἐν τῷ συνήθει καὶ κοινῷ τῆς διαλέκτου χαρακτῆρι μένῃ, χείρων δέ, ὅταν ἐκτρέψῃ τὴν διάλεκτον ἐκ τῆς συνήθους ἐπὶ τὰ ξένα ὀνόματα καὶ βεβιασμένα σχήματα, ὧν ἔνια σολοικισμῶν παρέχεται δόξαν, ἀρκεσθήσομαι τούτοις, ἵνα μὴ περαιτέρω τοῦ δέοντος ἡ γραφή μοι προβῇ.

34 Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν δημηγοριῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ δοκοῦντά μοι φανερὰ ποιήσειν ὑπεσχόμην, ἐν αἷς οἴονταί τινες τὴν ἄκραν τοῦ συγγραφέως εἶναι δύναμιν, διελόμενος καὶ ταύτην διχῇ τὴν θεωρίαν εἴς τε τὸ πραγματικὸν μέρος καὶ εἰς τὸ λεκτικὸν χωρὶς ὑπὲρ ἑκατέρου ποιήσομαι τὸν λόγον, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ πραγματικοῦ. ἐν ᾧ πρώτην μὲν ἔχει μοῖραν ἡ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων τε καὶ νοημάτων εὕρεσις, δευτέραν δὲ ἡ τῶν εὑρεθέντων χρῆσις· ἐκείνη μὲν ⟨ἐν⟩ τῇ φύσει μᾶλλον ἔχουσα τὴν ἰσχύν, αὕτη δὲ ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ. τούτων ἡ μὲν πλέον ἔχουσα τοῦ τεχνικοῦ τὸ φυσικὸν καὶ διδαχῆς ἐλάττονος δεομένη θαυμαστή τίς ἐστι παρὰ τῷ συγγραφεῖ· φέρει γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐκ πηγῆς πλουσίας ἄπειρόν τι χρῆμα νοημάτων τε καὶ ἐνθυμημάτων περιττῶν καὶ ξένων καὶ παραδόξων. ἡ δὲ πλεῖον ἔχουσα τὸ τεχνικὸν καὶ λαμπροτέραν ποιοῦσα φαίνεσθαι τὴν ἑτέραν ἐνδεεστέρα τοῦ δέοντος ἐπὶ πολλῶν. ὅσοι μὲν οὖν ἐκτεθαυμάκασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτριον, ὡς μηδὲν τῶν θεοφορήτων

would foresee their intentions, and that it was unnecessary to secure by action what they could secure by thought, were more often destroyed through being off their guard."

I could supply many more examples to prove that his narratives are more effective when he adheres to the familiar and normal style of speech, and less effective when he forsakes this familiar style and uses strange words and forced figures of speech, some of which have the appearance of solecisms. But I shall content myself with the foregoing examples, for fear that my treatise should become unduly long.

Since I have also promised to disclose my views on 34
his speeches, which some people think exhibit the historian's powers at their highest, I shall divide my discussion as before into two parts, content and style, and treat each separately, beginning with content. In the treatment of this the first place is occupied by the invention of arguments and ideas, the second by the deployment of this material, the former depending more upon native talent, the latter more upon art. The first, the product of natural ability rather than acquired skill, and requiring less training, is present to a remarkable degree in the historian: it draws forth an endless flow of striking, strange and unexpected ideas and arguments, as from a copious fountain. The second part, which involves a greater element of art, and whose function is to add lustre to the natural part, frequently falls short of requirements. Those who have admired Thucydides immoderately, crediting him with nothing less than

διαφέρειν, διὰ τὸ πλῆθος ἐοίκασι τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων τοῦτ' ἐσχηκέναι τὸ πάθος. οὓς ἐὰν διδάσκῃ τις ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ πράγματι παρατιθεὶς [1] τὸν λόγον, ὅτι ταυτὶ μὲν οὐκ ἦν ἐπιτήδεια ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων τῶν προσώπων λέγεσθαι, ταυτὶ δ' οὐκ ἐπὶ τούτοις τοῖς πράγμασιν οὐδὲ μέχρι τούτου, δυσχεραίνουσιν, ὅμοιόν τι πάσχοντες τοῖς κεκρατημένοις ὑφ' οἵας δή τινος ὄψεως ἔρωτι μὴ πολὺ ἀπέχοντι μανίας. ἐκεῖνοί τε γὰρ πάσας τὰς ἀρετάς, ὁπόσαι γίνονται περὶ μορφὰς εὐπρεπεῖς, ταῖς καταδεδουλωμέναις αὐτοὺς [2] προσεῖναι νομίζουσι, καὶ τοὺς ἐξονειδίζειν ἐπιχειροῦντας, εἴ τι περὶ αὐτὰς ὑπάρχει σίνος, ὡς βασκάνους καὶ συκοφάντας προβέβληνται· οὗτοί τε ὑπὸ τῆς μιᾶς ταύτης ἀρετῆς κεκαρωμένοι τὴν διάνοιαν ἅπαντα καὶ τὰ μὴ προσόντα τῷ συγγραφεῖ μαρτυροῦσιν· ἃ γὰρ ἕκαστος εἶναι βούλεται περὶ τὸ φιλούμενόν τε καὶ θαυμαζόμενον ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ταῦτα οἴεται. ὅσοι δ' ἀδέκαστον τὴν διάνοιαν φυλάσσουσι καὶ τὴν ἐξέτασιν τῶν λόγων ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀρθοὺς κανόνας ἀναφέρουσιν, εἴτε φυσικῆς τινος κρίσεως μετειληφότες εἴτε καὶ διὰ διδαχῆς ἰσχυρὰ τὰ κριτήρια κατασκευάσαντες, οὔτε ἅπαντα ἐπαινοῦσιν ἐπ' ἴσης οὔτε πρὸς ἅπαντα δυσχεραίνουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν κατορθώμασι τὴν προσήκουσαν μαρτυρίαν ἀπονέμουσιν, εἰ δέ τι διημάρτηται μέρος ἐν αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἐπαινοῦσιν. ὁ γοῦν ἐπὶ πάντων ἐγὼ τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ θεωρημάτων κανόνας ὑποτιθέμενος οὔτε πρότερον ὤκνησα τὰ δοκοῦντά μοι φέρειν ἐς μέσον οὔτε νῦν ἀποτρέψομαι. διδοὺς δὴ τὸ πρῶτον, ὥσπερ καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἔφην, τὸ

divine inspiration, seem to have been affected in this way by the sheer multitude of his ideas. If you take a speech and relate it to the particular circumstances in which it was made, and point out that one argument was inappropriate for use by these persons on this occasion, and another was unsuited for use in those circumstances and at such a length, his admirers take offence. They are suffering from the same sort of infatuation as a man overcome with an almost frantic love of some face or other. He thinks that the face which has captivated him possesses all the charms that go with a comely form; and those who attempt to criticise any blemishes that it has he accuses of slander and backbiting. In the same way Thucydides's admirers, hypnotised by this single virtue, also claim for him all the qualities that he does not possess: each man thinks what he wants to think about the object of his love and admiration. But those who keep an impartial mind and examine literature in accordance with correct standards, whether they are endowed with some natural power of appreciation or have developed their critical faculties by the help of instruction, do not praise everything alike or find fault with everything, but give due recognition to correct usage and withhold praise from any part that is seriously at fault.

Now in all my studies I have laid down my prin- 35
ciples of criticism: I have never previously hesitated to disclose my opinion, and shall not shrink from doing so now. I begin by repeating my acknowledge-

---

[1] *παρατιθεὶς* Sylburg: *περιτιθεὶς* codd.
[2] *αὐτοὺς* Sadée: *αὐτοὺς* codd.

περὶ τὴν εὕρεσιν τοῦ συγγραφέως εὔστοχον, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλως προὐπείληφεν [1] εἴτε διὰ φιλονεικίαν εἴ -τε δι' ἀναισθησίαν, ἁμαρτάνειν αὐτὸν οἰόμενος, θάτερον οὐκέτι δίδωμι, τὸ περὶ τὰς οἰκονομίας αὐτοῦ [2] τεχνικόν, πλὴν ἐπ' ὀλίγων πάνυ δημηγοριῶν. ὁρῶ δὲ καὶ ⟨τὰ⟩ [3] περὶ τὴν λέξιν ἐλαττώματα, περὶ ὧν ἤδη προείρηκα, πλεῖστα καὶ μέγιστα ταύταις συμβεβηκότα ταῖς ἰδέαις· καὶ γὰρ αἱ γλωττηματικαὶ καὶ ξέναι καὶ πεποιημέναι λέξεις ἐν ταύταις μάλιστα ἐπιπολάζουσι, καὶ τὰ πολύπλοκα καὶ ἀγκύλα καὶ βεβιασμένα σχήματα πλεῖστα περὶ ταύτας [4] ἐστίν. εἰ δὲ τὰ εἰκότα ἔγνωκα, σύ τε κρινεῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξέτασιν ἀγόμενος τῶν ἔργων. ἔσται δὲ κατὰ ταὐτὰ [5] ἡ παράθεσις αὐτῶν, ἀντιπαρεξεταζομένων τοῖς ἀρίστοις μοι δοκοῦσιν ἔχειν τῶν οὔτε κατὰ τὰς οἰκονομίας κατορθουμένων οὔτε κατὰ τὴν φράσιν ἀνεγκλήτων.

36 Ἐν μὲν οὖν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βύβλῳ ⟨τὴν⟩ [6] ἐπὶ Πλαταιὰς Λακεδαιμονίων τε καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἔλασιν ἀρξάμενος γράφειν ὑποτίθεται, τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων Ἀρχιδάμου μέλλοντος δηώσειν τὴν γῆν, πρέσβεις παρὰ τῶν Πλαταιέων ἀφιγμένους πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ λόγους ἀποδίδωσιν, οἵους εἰκὸς ἦν ὑπὸ ἀμφοτέρων εἰρῆσθαι, τοῖς ⟨τε⟩ [7] προσώποις πρέποντας καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν οἰκείους καὶ μήτ' ἐλλείποντας [8] τοῦ μετρίου μήτε ὑπεραί-

[1] προὐπείληφεν Krüger: προσυπείληφεν codd.
[2] αὐτοῦ Sadée: αὐτῷ codd.
[3] τὰ inseruit Sadée.
[4] ταύτας Reiske: ταῦτα codd.

ment of the historian's felicity of invention, which I made at the outset;[1] and if anyone has rashly assumed otherwise, either from contentiousness or from insensitivity, I think he is mistaken. But I do not go so far as to concede the other point, that he is as skilful in arrangement, except in a very small number of his speeches. I also note that the stylistic shortcomings to which I have already referred occur most frequently and prominently in this genre: recondite, strange and poetical expressions are very much in evidence in the speeches, and many complex, intricate and forced figures are to be found in them. It is for you, and for every other student who is prompted to examine his work, to decide whether my judgments are reasonable. The comparison will be conducted in the same way as before: those passages which I consider to be his best will be contrasted with those in which the arrangement is unsatisfactory and the style is open to criticism.

The episode which he describes at the beginning of 36
the second book is the attack upon Plataea by the 429 B.C.
Lacedaemonians and their allies. It starts at the point where the Lacedaemonian king Archidamus is about to ravage the land, and Plataean envoys have arrived at his camp. Thucydides assigns to both sides speeches such as each might naturally have made. They are suited to the characters of the speakers and relevant to the situation, and neither inadequate nor

[1] ch. 27.

[5] *κατὰ ταὐτὰ* Reiske: *κατὰ ταῦτα* codd.
[6] *τὴν* inseruit Reiske.
[7] *τε* inseruit Usener.
[8] *μήτ' ἐλλείποντας* Reiske: *μήτε λείποντας* codd.

ροντας, λέξει τε κεκόσμηκεν αὐτοὺς καθαρᾷ καὶ σαφεῖ καὶ συντόμῳ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετὰς ἐχούσῃ· τήν τε ἁρμονίαν οὕτως ἔναυλον ἀποδέδωκεν ⟨ὥσθ'⟩ ἅμα ⟨λόγοις⟩[1] τοῖς ἡδίστοις παρεξετάζεσθαι· "Τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἐς μὲν τὴν Ἀττικὴν οὐκ ἐσέβαλον, ἐστράτευσαν δ' ἐπὶ Πλάταιαν· ἡγεῖτο δ' Ἀρχίδαμος ὁ Ζευξιδάμου Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύς· καὶ καθίσας τὸν στρατὸν ἔμελλε δηώσειν τὴν γῆν. οἱ δὲ Πλαταιεῖς εὐθὺς πρέσβεις πέμψαντες πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλεγον τοιάδε· Ἀρχίδαμε καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὐ δίκαια ποιεῖτε οὐδὲ ἄξια οὔθ' ὑμῶν οὔτε πατέρων ὧν ἐστε, ἐς γῆν τὴν Πλαταιέων στρατεύοντες. Παυσανίας γὰρ ὁ Κλεομβρότου Λακεδαιμόνιος ἐλευθερώσας τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀπὸ τῶν Μήδων μετὰ Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἐθελησάντων συνάρασθαι τοῦ κινδύνου καὶ τῆς μάχης, ἣ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐγένετο, θύσας ἐν τῇ Πλαταιέων ἀγορᾷ ἱερὰ Διὶ ἐλευθερίῳ καὶ ξυγκαλέσας πάντας τοὺς συμμάχους, ἀπεδίδου Πλαταιεῦσι γῆν καὶ πόλιν τὴν σφετέραν ἔχοντας αὐτονόμους οἰκεῖν, στρατεῦσαί τε μηδένα ποτὲ ἀδίκως ἐπ' αὐτοὺς μηδ' ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀμύνειν τοὺς παρόντας ξυμμάχους κατὰ δύναμιν. τάδε μὲν ἡμῖν πατέρες οἱ ὑμέτεροι ἔδοσαν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ προθυμίας τῆς ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς κινδύνοις γενομένης. ὑμεῖς δὲ τἀναντία ἐκείνοις δράτε· μετὰ γὰρ Θηβαίων τῶν ἡμῖν ἐχθίστων ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἥκετε. μάρτυρας δὲ θεοὺς τούς τε ὁρκίους τότε γενομένους ποιούμενοι καὶ τοὺς

[1] ὥσθ' et λόγοις supplevi.

overdone. He has furnished them with language which is pure, clear and concise and possesses all the other virtues besides; and the arrangement is so melodious that it bears comparison with the most graceful ⟨writing⟩.[1]

"The following summer the Peloponnesians and their allies did not make an incursion into Attica, but marched against Plataea under the leadership of Archidamus the son of Zeuxidamus, king of the Lacedaemonians. He had encamped his army and was about to ravage the land, when the Plataeans forthwith sent out ambassadors to him, who spoke as follows:

"Archidamus and men of Lacedaemon, what you are doing is neither right nor worthy of yourselves or of your fathers, when you march against the territory of the Plataeans. For Pausanias the son of Cleombrotus, the Lacedaemonian, when he had liberated Greece from the Medes in company with those Greeks who had been willing to face with him the peril of the battle that was fought near our city, after 479 B.C.
sacrificing in the market-place of Plataea to Zeus the Liberator, and assembling all the allies, granted to the Plataeans the right to live in independent possession of their land and city, and that no one should ever make war upon them unjustly or enslave them; otherwise the allies then present should assist them to the best of their ability. These rewards your fathers gave us for the valour and zeal which we displayed in the face of those dangers. But you are doing the very opposite: for you have joined with the Thebans, our bitterest enemies, and come to enslave us. Therefore we call the gods to witness, both those who

[1] ii. 71.

ὑμετέρους πατρῴους καὶ ἡμετέρους ἐγχωρίους λέγομεν ὑμῖν, γῆν τὴν Πλαταιίδα μὴ ἀδικεῖν μηδὲ παραβαίνειν τοὺς ὅρκους, ἐᾶν δὲ οἰκεῖν αὐτονόμους, ὥσπερ Παυσανίας ἐδικαίωσε." τοιαῦτα τῶν Πλαταιέων λεγόντων Ἀρχίδαμος ἀποκρίνεται τοιάδε· " Δίκαια λέγετε, ὦ ἄνδρες Πλαταιεῖς, ἢν ποιῆτε ὅμοια τοῖς λόγοις. καθάπερ γὰρ Παυσανίας ὑμῖν παρέδωκεν, αὐτοί τε αὐτονομεῖσθε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ξυνελευθεροῦτε, ὅσοι μετασχόντες τῶν τότε κινδύνων ὑμῖν τε ξυνώμοσαν καί εἰσι νῦν ὑπ' Ἀθηναίοις· παρασκευή τε τοσήδε καὶ πόλεμος γεγένηται αὐτῶν ἕνεκα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐλευθερώσεως. ἧς μάλιστα μὲν μετασχόντες καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐμμείνατε τοῖς ὅρκοις. εἰ δὲ μή, ἅπερ καὶ πρότερον ἤδη προὐκαλεσάμεθα, ἡσυχίαν ἄγετε νεμόμενοι τὰ ὑμέτερα αὐτῶν· καὶ ἔστε μηδὲ μεθ' ἑτέρων, δέχεσθε δ' ἀμφοτέρους φίλους, ἐπὶ πολέμῳ δὲ μηδετέρους. καὶ τάδε ἡμῖν ἀρκέσει." ὁ μὲν Ἀρχίδαμος τοσαῦτα εἶπεν. οἱ δὲ Πλαταιῶν πρέσβεις ἀκούσαντες ταῦτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν· καὶ τῷ πλήθει τὰ ῥηθέντα κοινώσαντες ἀπεκρίναντο αὐτῷ, ὅτι ἀδύνατα εἴη σφίσι ποιεῖν, ἃ προκαλεῖται, ἄνευ Ἀθηναίων· παῖδες γὰρ σφῶν καὶ γυναῖκες παρ' ἐκείνοις εἴησαν. δεδιέναι δὲ καὶ περὶ πάσῃ τῇ πόλει, μὴ 'κείνων ἀποχωρησάντων Ἀθηναῖοι ἐλθόντες σφίσιν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπωσιν ἢ Θηβαῖοι ὡς ἔνορκοι ὄντες κατὰ τὸ ἀμφοτέρους δέχεσθαι αὖθις σφῶν τὴν πόλιν πειράσωσι καταλαβεῖν. ὃ δὲ θαρσύνων αὐτοὺς πρὸς ταῦτα ἔφη·

at that time received the oaths, and those of your own fathers and of our country, and charge you not to injure Plataean territory, nor break the oaths, but to let us live independent, as Pausanias saw fit to allow us."

"When the Plataeans had made such a speech, Archidamus replied in this manner:[1]

"Your words are just, Plataeans, if you act in accordance with them. Enjoy the freedom which Pausanias granted you yourselves, and also help in setting the rest of Greece free, those men who shared the dangers of those days with you and are now under Athenian rule, for whose liberation all this preparation and war has been undertaken. Do you, then, abide by the oaths, preferably by taking part in this liberation; but if not, then, as we proposed before, remain at peace in the enjoyment of your own possessions, and do not join either side, but receive both as friends, and for warlike purposes neither the one nor the other. And this will satisfy us."

"Such were the words of Archidamus. Having heard them the Plataean envoys returned to the city, and after communicating to the whole people what had been said, replied to him that it was impossible for them to do what he proposed without consulting the Athenians; for their children and wives were at Athens; and that they also had fears for the whole city, lest when the Lacedaemonians had retired, the Athenians might come and not leave it in their hands; or the Thebans, as signatories to the agreement that they should "receive both parties," might in their turn try to seize their city. To encourage them on both these points Archidamus said:

[1] ii. 72–75.

" Ὑμεῖς δὲ πόλιν μὲν καὶ οἰκίας ἡμῖν παράδοτε τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις, καὶ γῆς ὅρους ἀποδείξατε, καὶ δένδρα τὰ ὑμέτερα καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο δυνατὸν εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἐλθεῖν· αὐτοὶ δὲ μεταχωρήσατε ὅποι βούλεσθε, ἕως ἂν ὁ πόλεμος ᾖ· ἐπειδὰν δὲ παρέλθῃ, ἀποδώσομεν ὑμῖν, ἃ ἂν παραλάβωμεν· μέχρι δὲ τοῦδε ἔξομεν ὑμῖν παρακαταθήκην ἐργαζόμενοι καὶ ἀποφορὰν φέροντες, ἣ ἂν ὑμῖν ἱκανὴ μέλλῃ ἔσεσθαι." οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες αὖθις εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ βουλευσάμενοι μετὰ τοῦ πλήθους ἔλεξαν, ὅτι βούλονται Ἀθηναίοις κοινῶσαι πρῶτον ἃ προκαλεῖται, καὶ ἢν πείθωσιν αὐτούς, ποιεῖν ταῦτα. μέχρι δὲ τούτου σπείσασθαι σφίσιν ἐκέλευον καὶ τὴν γῆν μὴ δῃοῦν. ὃ δ' ἡμέρας τε ἐσπείσατο, ἐν αἷς εἰκὸς ἦν κομισθῆναι, καὶ τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἔτεμνεν. ἐλθόντες δὲ οἱ Πλαταιεῖς πρέσβεις ὡς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ βουλευσάμενοι μετ' αὐτῶν πάλιν ἦλθον ἀγγέλλοντες τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει τοιάδε· " Οὔτ' ἐν τῷ πρὸ τοῦ χρόνῳ, ἄνδρες Πλαταιεῖς, ἀφ' οὗ ξύμμαχοι ἐγενόμεθα, Ἀθηναῖοι φασὶν ἐν οὐδενὶ ὑμᾶς προέσθαι ἀδικουμένους οὔτε νῦν περιόψεσθαι, βοηθήσειν δὲ κατὰ δύναμιν· ἐπισκήπτουσίν τε ὑμῖν πρὸς τῶν ὅρκων, οὓς οἱ πατέρες ὤμοσαν, μηδὲν νεωτερίζειν περὶ τὴν συμμαχίαν." τοιαῦτα τῶν πρέσβεων ἀπαγγειλάντων οἱ Πλαταιεῖς ἐβουλεύσαντο Ἀθηναίους μὴ προδιδόναι, ἀλλ' ἀνασχέσθαι καὶ γῆν τεμνομένην, εἰ δέοι, ὁρῶντας καὶ ἄλλο πάσχοντας, ὅ τι ἂν ξυμβαίνῃ· ἐξελθεῖν τε μηδένα ἔτι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ

" In that case give up your city and houses to us, the Lacedaemonians, and indicate the boundaries of your territories and your trees and anything else that can be counted; and yourselves move wherever you please for the duration of the war. When it is over, we will restore to you whatever we may have received. Till then we will hold it in trust, cultivating it, and bringing to you such produce as will meet your needs sufficiently."

" When they had heard his proposal, they went again into the city, and after consulting with the people, said that they wished first to communicate to the Athenians what he proposed, and if they gained their agreement, then to do so: but till that time they begged him to grant them a truce, and not to lay waste the land. So he granted them a truce for the number of days they might take until their return, and in the meantime did not begin to ravage the land. The Plataean envoys went to consult with the Athenians, and on their return delivered the following message to those in the city:

" Men of Plataea, the Athenians say that never in time past, since we became allies, have they on any occasion deserted us when injured; nor will they neglect us now, but will assist us to the best of their power. And they charge you by the oaths which your father swore, not to depart from the terms of the alliance."

" When the ambassadors had delivered this message, the Plataeans resolved not to play false to the Athenians, but to endure, if necessary, both to see their land ravaged, and to suffer whatever else might befall them. They resolved also that no one should go out again, but that they should make their reply

τείχους ἀποκρίνασθαι, ὅτι ἀδύνατά ἐστι σφίσι ποιεῖν ἃ Λακεδαιμόνιοι προκαλοῦνται. ὡς δ' ἀπεκρίναντο, ἐντεῦθεν δὴ πρῶτον μὲν ἐς ἐπιμαρτυρίαν καὶ θεῶν καὶ ἡρώων τῶν ἐγχωρίων Ἀρχίδαμος ὁ βασιλεὺς κατέστη λέγων ὧδε· "Θεοὶ ὅσοι γῆν τὴν Πλαταιίδα ἔχετε, καὶ ἥρωες, ξυνίστορες ἔστε, ὅτι οὔτε τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀδίκως, ἐκλιπόντων δὲ τῶνδε προτέρων τὸ ξυνώμοτον ἐπὶ γῆν τήνδε ἤλθομεν, ἐν ᾗ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν εὐξάμενοι ὑμῖν Μήδων ἐκράτησαν καὶ παρέσχετε αὐτὴν εὐμενῆ ἐναγωνίσασθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, οὔτε νῦν ἴσμεν τι ποιῶμεν, ἀδικήσομεν· προκαλεσάμενοι γὰρ πολλὰ καὶ εἰκότα οὐ τυγχάνομεν. ξυγγνώμονες δὲ ἔστε τῆς μὲν ἀδικίας κολάζεσθαι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι προτέροις, τῆς δὲ τιμωρίας τυγχάνειν τοῖς ἐπιφέρουσι νομίμως." τοσαῦτα ἐπιθειάσας καθίστη εἰς πόλεμον τὸν στρατόν."

37 Ἐξετάσωμεν δὴ παρὰ τοῦτον τὸν διάλογον ⟨τὸν⟩ [1] οὕτω καλῶς καὶ περιττῶς ἔχοντα ἕτερον αὐτοῦ διάλογον, ὃν μάλιστα ἐπαινοῦσιν οἱ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος τούτου θαυμασταί. ὑποτίθεται δή, στρατιὰν ἀποστειλάντων Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ Μηλίους Λακεδαιμονίων ἀποίκους, πρὶν ἄρξασθαι τοῦ πολέμου, τὸν στρατηγὸν τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοὺς προβούλους τῶν Μηλίων συνιόντας εἰς λόγους περὶ καταλύσεως τοῦ πολέμου· καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου προσώπου δηλοῖ τὰ λεχθέντα ὑφ' ἑκατέρων, ἐπὶ μιᾶς δ' ἀποκρίσεως τοῦτο τὸ σχῆμα διατηρήσας, τὸ διηγηματικόν, προσωποποιεῖ τὸν μετὰ ταῦτα διάλογον καὶ δραματίζει.

[1] τὸν inseruit Usener.

from the wall, to the effect that it was impossible to do as the Lacedaemonians proposed. When they had given this answer, King Archidamus proceeded in the first place to call to witness the gods and heroes of the land, in these words:

"O gods and heroes who dwell in the land of Plataea, bear witness that it was neither unjustly in the first instance, but when these men had first broken the agreement they had sworn to, that we came against this land, in which our fathers prayed to you before they conquered the Medes, and which you made an auspicious land for Greeks to contend in. Nor shall we act unjustly now, whatever we may do; for although we have made many reasonable proposals, we are having no success. Grant then that those may be punished for the wrong who were the first to begin, and that those may obtain revenge who are lawfully trying to exact it."

"Having thus appealed to the gods, he committed his army to the war."

Let us compare this splendid and remarkable dia- 37
logue with another which is greatly praised by admirers of his style. The episode in question is that in which the Athenians have sent an expedition against the Melians, who were Spartan colonists; but 416 B.C.
before beginning hostilities the Athenian general and the Melian leaders meet to discuss possible terms of peace.[1] Thucydides begins by stating in his own person what each side said, but after maintaining this form of reported speech for only one exchange of argument, he dramatises the rest of the dialogue and makes the characters speak for themselves. The Athenian opens the dialogue with these words:[2]

[1] v. 84. [2] v. 85.

ἄρχει δ' ὁ Ἀθηναῖος τάδε λέγων· "Ἐπειδὴ οὐ πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος οἱ λόγοι γίγνονται, ὅπως δὴ μὴ συνεχεῖ ῥήσει οἱ λαοὶ ἐπαγωγὰ καὶ ἀνέλεγκτα ἐς ἅπαξ ἀκούσαντες ἡμῶν ἀπατηθῶσι (γιγνώσκομεν γὰρ ὅτι τοῦτο φρονεῖ ἡμῶν ἡ ἐς τοὺς ὀλίγους ἀγωγή), ὑμεῖς οἱ προκαθήμενοι ἔτι ἀσφαλέστερον ποιήσετε. καὶ μηδ' ὑμεῖς ἑνὶ λόγῳ ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ μὴ δοκοῦν ἐπιτηδείως λέγεσθαι εὐθὺς ὑπολαμβάνοντες κρίνετε· καὶ πρῶτον, εἰ ἀρέσκει ὡς λέγομεν, εἴπατε." οἱ δὲ τῶν Μηλίων σύνεδροι ἀπεκρίναντο· "Ἡ μὲν ἐπιείκεια τοῦ διδάσκειν καθ' ἡσυχίαν ἀλλήλους οὐ ψέγεται· τὰ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου παρόντα ἤδη καὶ οὐ μέλλοντα διαφέροντα αὐτοῦ φαίνετε." τοῦτο τὸ τελευταῖον εἴ τις ἐν τοῖς σχήμασιν ἀξιώσει φέρειν, οὐκ ἂν φθάνοι πάντας τοὺς σολοικισμούς, ὅσοι γίγνονται παρὰ τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς καὶ παρὰ τὰς πτώσεις, σχήματα καλῶν; προθεὶς γὰρ "ἡ μὲν ἐπιείκεια τοῦ διδάσκειν καθ' ἡσυχίαν οὐ ψέγεται," ἔπειτα συνάψας τῷ ἑνικῷ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὀρθὴν ἐξενηνεγμένῳ [1] πτῶσιν "τὰ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου παρόντα ἤδη καὶ οὐ μέλλοντα" ἐπιζεύγνυσι τούτοις ἑνικὸν καὶ κατὰ τὴν γενικὴν ἐσχηματισμένον πτῶσιν, εἴ τε ἄρθρον δεικτικὸν βούλεταί τις αὐτὸ καλεῖν εἴ τε ἀντονομασίαν, τὸ "αὐτοῦ"· τοῦτο δὲ οὔτε τῷ θηλυκῷ καὶ ἑνικῷ καὶ ὀνοματικῷ προσαρμοττόμενον σῴζει τὴν ἀκολουθίαν οὔτε τῷ πληθυντικῷ καὶ οὐδετέρῳ ⟨καὶ⟩ [2] κατὰ τὴν αἰτιατικὴν ἐσχηματισμένῳ πτῶσιν. ἦν δ' ἂν ὁ λόγος κατάλληλος οὕτω σχηματισθείς·

[1] ἐξενηνεγμένῳ Sylburg: ἐξενηνεγμένα codd.
[2] καὶ inserui Bücheler.

" Since the debate is not being held before the people, for fear, I suppose, that in listening to a single uninterrupted speech by us, they may be deceived by seductive arguments which they are unable to test at a single hearing (for we are perfectly aware that this is the purpose of our being brought before a select few), you who are their representatives will produce an even safer result. You too must not reply in a single long speech, but must decide immediately on each point of dispute as it arises. Now say first whether you like what we suggest." The Melian representatives replied:[1]

" The reasonableness of a quiet explanation of our respective positions meets with no criticism from us. But you indicate clearly a different intention from this by the preparations you are making for war now, and not in the future."

Surely anyone proposing to classify this last sentence as an example of figurative language would immediately have to give the same name to all the solecisms of number and case-usage? For he begins with " The reasonableness of a quiet explanation meets with no criticism," then he follows the nominative singular subject with the accusative " preparations for immediate, not future war," and " from this," in the genitive singular, which, whether we wish to call it a demonstrative article or a pronoun, corresponds neither to the nominative singular feminine nor to the accusative plural neuter, and therefore fails to preserve the agreement. The sentence would have been self-consistent if it had been constructed as follows:

[1] v. 86.

"ἡ μὲν ἐπιείκεια τοῦ διδάσκειν καθ' ἡσυχίαν ἀλλήλους οὐ ψέγεται, τὰ δὲ τοῦ πολέμου παρόντα ἤδη καὶ οὐ μέλλοντα διαφέροντα αὐτῆς φαίνεται." τούτοις ἐπιτίθησιν ἐνθύμημα νενοημένον μὲν οὐκ ἀτόπως, ἡρμηνευμένον δὲ οὐκ εὐπαρακολουθήτως· "Εἰ μὲν τοίνων ὑπονοίας τῶν μελλόντων λογιούμενοι ἢ ἄλλο τι ξυνήκετε, ἢ ἐκ τῶν παρόντων καὶ ὧν ὁρᾶτε περὶ σωτηρίας βουλεύσαντες τῇ πόλει,
38 παυόμεθα· εἰ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτο, λέγοιμεν ἄν." καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἀποστρέψας τοῦ διηγήματος τὸν διάλογον ἐπὶ τὸ δραματικὸν ταῦτα τὸν Ἀθηναίων ἀποκρινόμενον ποιεῖ· "Εἰκὸς μὲν καὶ ξυγγινώμη, ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε καθεστῶτας ἐπὶ πολλὰ καὶ λέγοντας καὶ δοκοῦντας τραπέσθαι." ἔπειτα εὐσχήμονα πρόθεσιν ὑποθέμενος "ἡ μέντοι ξύνοδος καὶ περὶ σωτηρίας ἤδη πάρεστι, καὶ ὁ λόγος, ᾧ προκαλεῖσθε τρόπῳ, εἰ δοκεῖ, γιγνέσθω" πρῶτον μὲν εὕρηκεν ἐνθύμημα οὔτε τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως ἄξιον οὔτ' ἐπὶ τοιούτοις πράγμασιν ἁρμόττον λέγεσθαι "Ἡμεῖς τοίνυν οὔτε αὐτοὶ μετ' ὀνομάτων καλῶν, ὡς ἢ δικαίως τὸν Μῆδον καταλύσαντες ἄρχομεν, ἢ ἀδικούμενοι νῦν ἐπεξερχόμεθα, λόγων μῆκος ἄπιστον παρέξομεν·" τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν ὁμολογοῦντος τὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς μηδὲν ἀδικοῦντας στράτευσιν, ἐπειδὴ περὶ μηδετέρου τούτων βούλεται τὸν λόγον ὑπέχειν· οἷς ἐπιτίθησιν "οὔθ' ὑμᾶς ἀξιοῦμεν ἢ

[1] v. 87.
[2] v. 88. Thucydides actually assigns this to the Melian spokesmen.
[3] v. 89.

" The reasonableness of a quiet explanation of our respective positions meets with no criticism from us, but the preparations which you are making for immediate, not future war are clearly contrary to reason."

After this he introduces an idea which is by no means ill-conceived, but which is expressed in a form that is difficult to understand: [1]

" If you have come merely to argue about what you suppose may happen, or for any other reason than to deliberate for the safety of your city in the situation in which you see it now, we have no more to say; but if the latter is your intention, we can talk."

After this he changes the style of the dialogue from narrative to dramatic, and makes the Athenian answer: [2] 38

" It is a natural and excusable thing that men in your position should have much to say and should try many expedients in speech and thought."

Then, after introducing a noble sentiment:

" But this conference has met now to consider the question of our preservation, so let the argument proceed, if you please, in the manner you propose "—he first conjures up a sentiment which is both unworthy of the Athenians, and does not fit the situation: [3]

" Now we Athenians shall use no fine words or long and unconvincing arguments to try to prove that we have earned our empire by conquering the Persians, or that we are attacking you now because you are injuring us."

This is tantamount to an admission that the expedition is against innocent victims, in that he does not wish to support either of these statements with argument. He then continues:

ὅτι Λακεδαιμονίων ἄποικοι ὄντες οὐ ξυνεστρατεύσατε ἢ ὡς ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ἠδικήκατε λέγοντας οἴεσθαι πείσειν, τὰ δυνατὰ δ' ἐξ ὧν ἑκάτεροι ἀληθῶς φρονοῦμεν διαπράσσεσθαι." τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν· "ὑμεῖς μὲν ἀληθῶς φρονοῦντες ὅτι ἀδικεῖσθε, τὴν ἀνάγκην φέρετε καὶ εἴκετε· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἀγνοοῦντες, ὅτι ἀδικοῦμεν ὑμᾶς, τῆς ἀσθενείας ὑμῶν περιεσόμεθα τῇ βίᾳ· ταῦτα γὰρ ἑκατέροις δυνατά." ἔπειτα τὴν αἰτίαν ἀποδοῦναι τούτου βουληθεὶς ἐπιλέγει· "ὅτι δίκαια μὲν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρωπείῳ λόγῳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἴσης ἀνάγκης κρίνεται, δυνατὰ δὲ οἱ προὔχοντες πράσσουσι καὶ οἱ ἀσθενεῖς ξυγχω-
39 ροῦσι." βασιλεῦσι γὰρ βαρβάροις ταῦτα πρὸς Ἕλληνας ἥρμοττε λέγειν· Ἀθηναίοις δὲ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, οὓς ἠλευθέρωσαν ἀπὸ τῶν Μήδων, οὐκ ἦν προσήκοντα εἰρῆσθαι, ὅτι τὰ δίκαια τοῖς ἴσοις ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τὰ δὲ βίαια τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς. ὀλίγα δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα τῶν Μηλίων ἀποκριναμένων, ὅτι καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις προνοεῖν τοῦ δικαίου, μὴ καὶ αὐτοί ποτε σφαλέντες ὑπ' ἄλλων ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ γένωνται καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχωσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἰσχυροτέρων, ἀποκρινόμενοι ποιεῖ τὸν Ἀθηναῖον "Ἡμεῖς δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρχῆς, ἣν καὶ παυθῇ, οὐκ ἀθυμοῦμεν τὴν τελευτήν," τούτου δ' αἰτίαν ἀποδιδόντα, ὅτι κἂν καταλύσωσιν αὐτῶν Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὴν ἀρχήν, συγγνώμην ἕξουσι, καὶ αὐτοὶ

" Nor do we expect you to hope to convince us by arguing that, although a colony of the Lacedaemonians, you have not joined their expeditions, or that you have never done us any wrong. But we do expect you to try to achieve what is practicable, in view of what we both correctly have in mind.

This means: " You are correct in thinking that you are being wronged, but you must put up with it and yield. We are quite aware that we are treating you unjustly, but we shall overcome your weakness with our strength: such are our respective capabilities." Then, by way of explanation of this, he adds:

" We both know that the question of justice enters into human affairs only where the pressure of constraint is equal, and that the powerful exact what they can and the weak concede what they must."

These would have been suitable words for bar- 39
barian kings to address to Greeks, but no Athenian should have spoken thus to Grecks whom they had liberated from the Persians, saying that right is a matter of reciprocity between equals, whereas force is exerted by the strong against the weak. When the Melians have replied briefly to this, suggesting that the Athenians would do well to consider what is right in case they should themselves one day slip up and find themselves in the power of others, and suffer the same fate at the hands of stronger enemies, Thucydides makes the Athenian representative reply: [1]

" The possible fall of our empire is not an event to which we look forward with dismay."

And he gives as his reason for this statement that, even if the Lacedaemonians should destroy their empire, they would treat them with indulgence, since

[1] v. 91.

πολλὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες. θήσω δὲ καὶ τὴν λέξιν αὐτοῦ· "οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἄλλων, ὥσπερ καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὗτοι δεινοὶ τοῖς νικηθεῖσι." τοῦτο δὲ ὅμοιόν ἐστι τῷ λέγειν, ὅτι παρὰ τοῖς τυράννοις οὐ μισοῦνται τύραννοι. οἷς ἐπιτίθησιν "καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτου ἡμῖν ἀφείσθω κινδυνεύεσθαι," ὃ μόγις ἂν εἶπεν τῶν καταποντιστῶν τις ἢ λῃστῶν "οὐδὲν ἐπιστρέφομαι τῆς μετὰ ταῦτα τιμωρίας χαρισάμενος ἐπιθυμίαις ἐν τῷ παρόντι." ἔπειτ' ὀλίγων τῶν μεταξὺ γενομένων ἀμοιβαίων καὶ τῶν Μηλίων εἰς ἐπιεικῆ συγκαταβαινόντων αἵρεσιν "Ὥστε δὲ ἡσυχίαν ἄγοντας ἡμᾶς φίλους μὲν εἶναι ἀντὶ πολεμίων, ξυμμάχους δὲ μηδετέρων οὐκ ἂν δέξαισθε;" ἀποκρινόμενον ποιεῖ τὸν Ἀθηναῖον "Οὐ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἡμᾶς βλάπτει ἡ ἔχθρα ὑμῶν, ὅσον ἡ φιλία μὲν ἀσθενείας, τὸ δὲ μῖσος δυνάμεως παράδειγμα τοῖς ἀρχομένοις δηλούμενον," ἐνθύμημα πονηρὸν καὶ σκολιῶς ἀπηγγελμένον· εἰ δὲ τὸ νόημα βούλεταί τις αὐτοῦ σκοπεῖν, τοιόνδε ἐστίν, ὅτι "φιλοῦντες μὲν ἡμᾶς ἀσθενεῖς φαίνεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ποιήσετε, μισοῦντες δὲ ἰσχυρούς· οὐ γὰρ ζητοῦμεν εὐνοίᾳ τῶν ὑπηκόων ἄρχειν, ἀλλὰ φόβῳ." τούτοις ἕτερα προσθεὶς πάλιν ἀμοιβαῖα περίεργα καὶ πικρά, τοὺς Μηλίους ὑποτίθεται λέγοντας, ὅτι κοινὰς τὰς

[1] v. 94.
[2] v. 95.
[3] v. 102.

they often behave in the same way themselves. I shall quote his actual words:

" Ruling states, like that of the Lacedaemonians, are not as formidable as that to their conquered enemies."

This is equivalent to saying that tyrants are not hated among tyrants. He then continues:

" But this is a danger which you may leave to us."

Which is equivalent to saying " Once I have gratified my present desires I do not trouble about future retribution," a sentiment which would scarcely have been uttered by a pirate or a freebooter. Then, after a few further exchanges have taken place, and the Melians come to the point of suggesting a reasonable compromise: [1]

" Would you not accept as a solution our neutrality, whereby we should be inactive, regarding you as friends rather than as enemies, but neither side as our ally? "

He makes the Athenian reply: [2]

" No, for your enmity does us less harm than the realisation by our subjects that your friendship is evidence of our weakness and your hatred of our power."

A base sentiment, awkwardly expressed, the sense of which, if anyone wishes to examine it, is something like this: " If you show us friendship you will make us seem weak in the eyes of others, but if you hate us we shall be thought strong; for we seek to rule our subjects not by the help of their good will but through their fear."

After adding still further laboured and harsh exchanges, he next makes the Melians say [3] that all who engage in war are subject to the same forces of

τύχας φέρουσιν οἱ πολέμιοι καὶ "τὸ μὲν εἶξαι εὐθὺς ἀνέλπιστον, μετὰ δὲ τοῦ δρωμένου ἔτι καὶ στῆναι ἐλπὶς ὀρθῶς." πρὸς ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὸν Ἀθηναῖον ἀποκρινόμενον λαβυρίνθων σκολιώτερα περὶ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἐπὶ κακῷ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις γινομένης, κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως γράφων· "Ἐλπὶς δὲ κινδύνου παραμύθιον οὖσα τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ περιουσίας χρωμένους αὐτῇ κἂν βλάψῃ, οὐ καθεῖλεν· τοῖς δὲ ἐς πᾶν τὸ ὑπάρχον ἀναρριπτοῦσι (δάπανος γὰρ φύσει) ἅμα τε γιγνώσκεται σφαλέντων, καὶ ἐν ὅτῳ φυλάξεταί τις αὐτὴν γνωρισθεῖσαν, οὐκ ἐλλείπει. ὃ ὑμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς τε καὶ ἐπὶ ῥοπῆς μιᾶς ὄντες μὴ βούλεσθε παθεῖν μηδ' ὁμοιωθῆναι τοῖς πολλοῖς, οἷς παρὸν ἀνθρωπείως ἔτι σῴζεσθαι, ἐπειδὰν πιεζομένους αὐτοὺς ἐπιλείπωσιν αἱ φανεραὶ ἐλπίδες, ἐπὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς καθίστανται, μαντικήν τε καὶ χρησμοὺς καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα μετ' ἐλπίδων λυμαίνεται." ταῦτ' οὐκ οἶδα πῶς ἄν τις ἐπαινέσειεν ὡς προσήκοντα εἰρῆσθαι στρατηγοῖς Ἀθηναίων, ὅτι λυμαίνεται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐλπὶς καὶ οὔτε χρησμῶν ὄφελος οὔτε μαντικῆς τοῖς εὐσεβῆ καὶ δίκαιον προῃρημένοις τὸν βίον. εἰ γάρ τι καὶ ἄλλο, τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως καὶ τοῦτ' ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἐστὶν ἐγκώμιον, τὸ περὶ παντὸς πράγματος καὶ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ τοῖς θεοῖς ἕπεσθαι καὶ μηδὲν ἄνευ μαντικῆς καὶ χρησμῶν ἐπιτελεῖν. λεγόντων τε τῶν Μηλίων, ὅτι σὺν τῇ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν βοηθείᾳ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις πεποίθασιν, οὓς εἰ καὶ διὰ μηδὲν ἄλλο, διὰ γοῦν

[1] v. 103.

chance, and " to yield at once would be to abandon hope, but with the help of action there is still some hope that we shall remain unsubdued." He makes the Athenian reply to this with an argument which is more tortuous than a maze, on the subject of the hope which men feel when they are in danger. The passage runs as follows: [1]

" Hope is a comfort in the hour of danger, and when those who employ her have ample resources, though damaging, she is not disastrous; but those who go so far as to risk their all (for she is extravagant by nature) recognise her only in the hour of their fall, whereas so long as one will guard against her after she has been recognised, she does not fail him. You are weak, and a single turn of the scale may ruin you: do not choose to suffer, like most others who might yet be saved by human means but who, when they find themselves hard pressed and palpable grounds of confidence gone, have recourse to the invisible, to prophesies and oracles and the like, which ruin men by the hopes they inspire."

I do not know how these words can be considered appropriate in the mouths of Athenian generals. They imply that divinely-inspired hope is harmful to men, and that oracles and prophesy are of no use to those who have chosen a pious and just way of life. Now if one aspect of Athenian life is to be singled out for special praise it is that they followed divine guidance on every matter and in every crisis, and took no decisive action without consulting soothsayers and oracles. And when the Melians say that, in addition to divine aid, they have placed their trust in the Lacedaemonians, who would help them from a feeling of shame, if for no other reason, and would not stand

τὴν αἰσχύνην αὐτοῖς βοηθήσειν καὶ οὐ περιόψεσθαι συγγενεῖς ἀπολλυμένους, αὐθαδέστερον ἔτι τὸν Ἀθηναῖον ἀποκρινόμενον εἰσάγει· "Τῆς μὲν τοίνυν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐμενείας οὐδ' ἡμεῖς οἰόμεθα λελείψεσθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔξω τῆς μὲν ἀνθρωπείας, τῆς δ' εἰς τὸ θεῖον νεμέσεως τῶν τ' εἰς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς βουλήσεων δικαιοῦμεν ἢ πράσσομεν. ἡγούμεθα γὰρ τό τε θεῖον δόξῃ τἀνθρώπειόν τε σαφῶς διὰ παντὸς ἀπὸ φύσεως ἀναγκαίως, οὗ ἂν κρατῇ, ἄρχειν·" τούτων ὁ νοῦς ἔστι μὲν δυσείκαστος καὶ τοῖς πάνυ δοκοῦσιν ἐμπείρως τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἔχειν, κατακλείεται δ' εἰς τοιοῦτόν τι πέρας, ὅτι τὸ μὲν θεῖον δόξῃ γινώσκουσιν ἅπαντες, τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δίκαια τῷ κοινῷ τῆς φύσεως κρίνουσι νόμῳ· οὗτος δ' ἔστιν ἄρχειν ὧν ἂν δύνηταί τις κρατεῖν. ἀκόλουθα καὶ ταῦτα τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ οὔτε Ἀθηναίοις οὔτε Ἕλλησι πρέποντα εἰρῆσθαι.

41 Πολλὰς δυνάμενος ἔτι διανοίας παρασχέσθαι τὸ συνετὸν ἐχούσας πονηρόν, ἵνα μὴ πλείων ὁ λόγος γένοιτό μοι τοῦ μετρίου, τὴν τελευταίαν ἔτι προσθήκην παραλήψομαι μόνην, ἣν ἀπαλλαττόμενος ἐκ τοῦ συλλόγου ὁ Ἀθηναῖος εἴρηκεν· "ἀλλ' ὑμῶν τὰ μὲν ἰσχυρὰ ὄντα ἐλπιζόμενα μέλλεται, τὰ δὲ παρόντα βραχέα πρὸς τὰ ἤδη ἀντιτεταγμένα περιγενέσθαι. πολλήν γε ἀλογίαν" φησί "τῆς διανοίας παρέχετε, εἰ μὴ μεταστησάμενοι ἡμᾶς ἄλλό τι τῶιδε σωφρονέστερον γνώσεσθε." οἷς ἐπιτίθησιν "οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἐπί γε τὴν ἐν τοῖς

[1] v. 105.

by and watch their kinsmen being destroyed, Thucydides makes the Athenian retort in an even more arrogant manner:[1]

"As for the favour of the gods, we expect to have quite as much as you: for we are not claiming or doing anything which goes beyond the accepted limits of men's personal desires or of what is allowed them in relation to other men or with regard to the gods. For of the gods we believe, and of men we know, that by a universal law of their nature they will rule whomever they can conquer."

The meaning of this is difficult to conjecture, even for those who think they are quite familiar with the author; and the argument ends in some such conclusion as this, that everyone thinks he knows what the will of the gods is, but decides his own rights in relation to his fellows according to a common law of human nature, that it is right to rule anyone whom you can conquer. This is consequent upon the first arguments, and should not be heard coming either from an Athenian or from any other Greek.

I could furnish many more examples of clever but 41
perverted thinking, but in order to avoid unduly prolonging my argument I shall quote only the parting words with which the Athenian representative breaks off the dialogue:[2]

"But your strongest arguments, being objects of hope, are still in the future, but your present power is small compared with what is now arrayed against you. You are showing a great want of reason," he says, "unless you come to a more sensible conclusion after letting us withdraw." He then adds: "For surely

[2] v. 111.

αἰσχροῖς καὶ προὔπτοις κινδύνοις πλεῖστα διαφθείρουσαν ἀνθρώπους αἰσχύνην τρέψεσθε. πολλοῖς γὰρ προορωμένοις ἔτι ἐς οἷα φέρονται τὸ αἰσχρὸν καλούμενον ὀνόματος ἐπαγωγοῦ δυνάμεις ἐπεσπάσατο ἡσσηθεῖσι τοῦ ῥήματος ἔργῳ συμφοραῖς ἀνηκέστοις ὁρῶντας περιπεσεῖν."

Τούτων τῶν λόγων ὅτι μὲν οὔτε αὐτὸς μετέσχεν ὁ συγγραφεὺς τῷ συλλόγῳ τότε παρατυχὼν οὔτε τῶν διαθεμένων αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναίων ἢ Μηλίων ἤκουσεν, ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης[1] βύβλῳ περὶ αὐτοῦ[2] γράφει, μαθεῖν ῥᾴδιον, ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει στρατηγίαν ἐξελαθεὶς τῆς πατρίδος πάντα τὸν λοιπὸν τοῦ πολέμου χρόνον ἐν Θρᾴκῃ διέτριψε. λείπεται δὴ σκοπεῖν, εἰ τοῖς τε πράγμασι προσήκοντα καὶ τοῖς συνεληλυθόσιν εἰς τὸν σύλλογον προσώποις ἁρμόττοντα πέπλακε ⟨τὸν⟩[3] διάλογον "ἐχόμενος ὡς ἔγγιστα τῆς συμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων," ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ τῆς ἱστορίας προείρηκεν. ἆρ' οὖν ὥσπερ τοῖς Μηλίοις οἰκεῖοι καὶ προσήκοντες ἦσαν οἱ περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας λόγοι παρακαλοῦντες τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μὴ καταδουλοῦσθαι πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα μηδὲν ἁμαρτάνουσαν εἰς αὐτούς, οὕτως καὶ τοῖς Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοῖς πρέποντες ἦσαν οἱ περὶ τῶν δικαίων μήτ' ἐξετάζειν ἐῶντες μήτε λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς βίας καὶ πλεονεξίας νόμον εἰσάγοντες καὶ ταῦτ' εἶναι δίκαια τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ἀποφαίνοντες, ὅσα τοῖς ἰσχυροτέροις δοκεῖ; ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ

[1] πρὸ ταύτης Krüger: πρὸ αὐτῆς codd.
[2] αὐτοῦ Krüger: αὐτοῦ codd.
[3] τὸν inseruit Sadée.

you are not going to turn to that false sense shame of which, when dangers threaten that are disgraceful because foreseen, has ruined men so often. Even when people can foresee the direction in which they are heading, the idea of shame often draws down upon them the powerful implications of a misleading name; so that, unable to resist a word, they fall in fact, with their eyes open, into irretrievable disaster."

From what the historian writes about himself in the previous book,[1] it is easy to deduce that he neither was present at this meeting nor took part personally in the discussion, nor received a report of it from any of the Athenian or Melian spokesmen, because he spent all the rest of the war, after his command at Amphipolis, in exile in Thrace.[2] It now remains to 424 B.C. consider whether he has composed the dialogue in such a way that it is consistent with the facts and fits the character of the delegates to the meeting, "adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said," as he said he would do in his introduction.[3] Very well. The arguments about freedom, calling upon the Athenians not to enslave a Greek city that has done them no wrong, were fitting and appropriate for the Melians. But were the speeches of the Athenian generals equally appropriate, when they did not allow discussion or even mention of justice, but introduced the law of violence and greed and declared that for the weak justice is the will of the stronger? I do not think that such arguments

[1] cf. iv. 104–108; v. 26.5.

[2] Thucydides's Thracian connections are mentioned by his biographer Marcellinus, who also says that Thucydides died in Thrace (45, 55).

[3] i. 22.

οἶομαι τοῖς ἐκ τῆς εὐνομωτάτης πόλεως ἐπὶ τὰς ἔξω πόλεις ἀποστελλομένοις ἡγεμόσι ταῦτα προσήκειν λέγεσθαι, οὐδ' ἂν ἀξιώσαιμι τοὺς μὲν μικροπολίτας καὶ μηδὲν ἔργον ἐπιφανὲς ἀποδειξαμένους Μηλίους πλέονα τοῦ καλοῦ ποιεῖσθαι πρόνοιαν ἢ τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦς καὶ πάντα ἑτοίμους εἶναι τὰ δεινὰ ὑποφέρειν, ἵνα μηδὲν ἄσχημον ἀναγκασθῶσι πράττειν, τοὺς δὲ προελομένους τήν τε χώραν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐκλιπεῖν κατὰ τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον Ἀθηναίους, ἵνα μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν ὑπομείνωσιν ἐπίταγμα, τῶν ταὐτὰ [1] προαιρουμένων ὡς ἀνοήτων κατηγορεῖν. οἶομαι δ', ὅτι κἂν εἴ τινες ἄλλοι παρόντων Ἀθηναίων ταῦτα ἐπεχείρουν λέγειν, ἐπαχθῶς ἤνεγκαν ἂν οἱ τὸν κοινὸν βίον ἐξημερώσαντες. ἐγὼ μὲν δὴ διὰ ταύτας τὰς αἰτίας οὐκ ἐπαινῶ τὸν διάλογον τοῦτον ἀντιπαρεξετάζων τὸν ἕτερον. ἐν ἐκείνῳ μὲν γὰρ Ἀρχίδαμος ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος δίκαιά τε προκαλεῖται τοὺς Πλαταιεῖς καὶ λέξει κέχρηται καθαρᾷ καὶ σαφεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν ἐχούσῃ σχῆμα βεβασανισμένον οὐδὲ ἀνακόλουθον· ἐν τούτῳ δὲ οἱ φρονιμώτατοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων αἴσχιστα μὲν ἐνθυμήματα φέρουσιν, ἀηδεστάτῃ δ' αὐτὰ περιλαμβάνουσι λέξει· εἰ μὴ ἄρα μιησικακῶν ὁ συγγραφεὺς τῇ πόλει διὰ τὴν καταδίκην ταῦτα τὰ ὀνείδη κατεσκέδασεν αὐτῆς, ἐξ ὧν ἅπαντες μισήσειν αὐτὴν ἔμελλον. ἃ γὰρ οἱ προεστηκότες τῶν πόλεων καὶ τηλικαύτας ἐξουσίας πιστευόμενοι φρονεῖν τε καὶ λέγειν ⟨ἐοίκασι⟩ [2] πρὸς τὰς πόλεις ὑπὲρ τῆς αὑτῶν πατρίδος, ταῦτα κοινὰ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἅπαντες εἶναι τῆς ἀποστελ-

[1] ταὐτὰ Sylburg: ταῦτα codd.

as these would be fittingly used by the leaders of the city with the best laws in the world when they are on missions abroad, nor should I expect the inhabitants of a tiny state like Melos, who never did anything to distinguish themselves, to prefer the nobler to the safer policy and to be prepared to undergo every kind of suffering in order to avoid the necessity of a discreditable course of action; while the Athenians, who during the Persian War chose to leave their land and their city rather than submit to any base imposition, accuse them of being senseless when they follow the same principles. I think that if anyone else had attempted to express these views in the presence of the Athenians, the latter, who had civilised the life of all mankind, would have been offended. For these reasons I find this dialogue inferior by comparison with the earlier one. In that former dialogue the demands which the Lacedaemonian Archidamus makes on the Plataeans are fair, and he speaks in pure, clear language without any tortured or disordered forms of expression; whereas in the Melian Dialogue the wisest of the Greeks adduce the most disgraceful arguments, and invest them with the most disagreeable language. Perhaps it was because the historian bore his city a grudge for the sentence passed on him that he has deluged her with these reproaches, which were calculated to make her universally hated: for when the leaders of a state, entrusted by her with great power and appointed to represent her on missions to other states, seem to express certain views, those views are assumed by all

[2] ἐοίκασι inserui Usener.

λούσης πόλεως αὐτούς. καὶ περὶ μὲν τῶν διαλόγων ἅλις.

42 Τῶν δὲ δημηγορικῶν λόγων τεθαύμακα μὲν τὸν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ βύβλῳ ῥηθέντα ἐν Ἀθήναις ὑπὸ Περικλέους περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἴκειν Λακεδαιμονίοις, τὸν ἔχοντα τήνδε τὴν ἀρχήν· "Τῆς μὲν γνώμης, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀεὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἔχομαι, μὴ εἴκειν Πελοποννησίοις" ὡς καὶ τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν ἡρμηνευμένον δαιμονίως καὶ οὔτε κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν μορίων οὔτε κατὰ τὴν ἐξαλλαγὴν τῶν σχηματισμῶν τῶν ἀνακολούθων καὶ βεβιασμένων ἐνοχλοῦντα τὰς ἀκοάς, πάσας δὲ περιειληφότα τὰς ἀρετάς, ὁπόσαι γίγνονται περὶ δημηγορικοὺς ⟨λόγους⟩·[1] καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ Νικίου τοῦ στρατηγοῦ ῥηθέντας ἐν Ἀθήναις ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς Σικελίαν στρατείας· τήν τε πεμφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐπιστολήν, ἐν ᾗ χρῄζει συμμαχίας ἄλλης καὶ διαδόχου, κάμνων τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ νόσου· καὶ τὴν παράκλησιν τῶν στρατιωτῶν, ἣν ἐποιήσατο πρὸ τῆς τελευταίας ναυμαχίας· καὶ τὸν παραμυθητικὸν λόγον, ὅτε πεζῇ τὴν στρατιὰν ἔμελλεν ἀπάγειν, ἀπολωλεκὼς τὰς τριήρεις ἁπάσας· καὶ εἴ τινές εἰσιν ἄλλαι τοιαῦται δημηγορίαι καθαραὶ καὶ σαφεῖς καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀληθινοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐπιτήδειοι. ὑπὲρ ἁπάσας δὲ τὰς ἐν ταῖς ἑπτὰ βύβλοις φερομένας τὴν Πλαταιέων ἀπολογίαν τεθαύμακα παρ' οὐδὲν οὕτως ἕτερον ὡς τὸ μὴ βεβασανίσθαι μηδὲ κατεπιτετηδεῦσθαι, ἀληθεῖ δέ τινι καὶ φυσικῷ κεκοσμῆσθαι χρώματι. τά τε γὰρ ἐνθυμή-

[1] λόγους supplevit Krüger.

to be those of the state which sent them out. That is sufficient on the subject of the dialogues.

Among the political speeches, I admire the one in 42
the second book which Pericles made at Athens about not giving in to the Lacedaemonians. It begins with these words:[1]

"I hold firmly to the same opinion as ever, Athenians, that we should not yield to the Peloponnesians. . . ."

Its arguments are brilliantly conveyed, and it does not offend the ear either by the arrangement of its parts or by any perversity in the choice of figures that are obscure and forced, and it contains all the virtues of political oratory. I find the same qualities in the speeches made by the general Nicias at Athens on the subject of the Sicilian Expedition,[2] and in the letter sent by him to the Athenians, in which he asked for reinforcements and a successor in his command because he was exhausted as the result of ill-health;[3] and the speech in which he rallied his men before the final sea-battle;[4] and the consolatory speech which he made as he was about to withdraw his army by land after losing all the ships;[5] and all the other speeches in this style—pure, clear and suitable for the crises of real life. But most of all the speeches contained in the seven books I admire the defence of the Plataeans,[6] not so much for any other reason as because there is nothing tortured or contrived about it, but it is adorned with authentic natural colouring.

[1] i. 140–144.
[2] vi. 9–14; 20–23.
[3] vii. 11–15.
[4] vii. 61–64.
[5] vii. 77.
[6] iii. 53–59. See note 8, p. 483.

ματα πάθους ἐστὶ μεστὰ καὶ ἡ λέξις οὐκ ἀποστρέφουσα τὰς ἀκοάς· ἥ τε γὰρ σύνθεσις εὐεπὴς καὶ τὰ σχήματα τῶν πραγμάτων ἴδια. ταῦτα δὴ τὰ Θουκυδίδου ζηλωτὰ ἔργα, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων τὰ μιμήματα τοῖς ἱστοριογραφοῦσιν ὑποτίθεμαι [1] λαμβάνειν.

43 Τὴν δ' ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βύβλῳ Περικλέους ἀπολογίαν, ἣν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ διετίθετο τραχυνομένων Ἀθηναίων, ὅτι τὸν πόλεμον ἔπεισεν αὐτοὺς ἀναλαβεῖν, οὐχ ὅλην ἐπαινῶ· οὐδὲ τὰς περὶ τῆς Μυτιληναίων πόλεως δημηγορίας, ἃς διέθεντο Κλέων καὶ Διόδοτος, ⟨τὰς⟩ [2] ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ βύβλῳ· οὐδὲ τὴν Ἑρμοκράτους τοῦ Συρακοσίου πρὸς Καμαριναίους· οὐδὲ τὴν Εὐφήμου τοῦ πρεσβευτοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὴν ἐναντίαν ταύτης, οὐδὲ τὰς ὁμοίας ταύταις· οὐ γὰρ ἀνάγκη πάσας ἐξαριθμεῖσθαι τὰς εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν κατεσκευασμένας τῆς διαλέκτου χαρακτῆρα. ἵνα δὲ μὴ δόξῃ τις φάσεις ἀναποδείκτους με λέγειν, πολλὰς παρασχέσθαι πίστεις δυνάμενος δυσὶν ἀρκεσθήσομαι δημηγορίαις, ἵνα μὴ μακρὸς ὁ λόγος γένηται, τῇ Περικλέους ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἑρμοκράτους πρὸς Καμαριναίους κατηγορίᾳ κατὰ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως.

44 Ὁ μὲν οὖν Περικλῆς ταῦτα λέγει· "Καὶ προσδεχομένῳ μοι τὰ τῆς ὀργῆς ὑμῶν εἰς ἐμὲ γεγένηται (αἰσθάνομαι γὰρ τὰς αἰτίας), καὶ ἐκκλησίαν τούτου ἕνεκα ξυνήγαγον, ὅπως ὑπομνήσω καὶ μέμψωμαι, εἴ τι μὴ ὀρθῶς ἢ ἐμοὶ χαλεπαίνετε ἢ ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς εἴκετε." ταῦτα Θουκυδίδῃ μὲν

[1] *ὑποτίθεμαι* Reiske: *ὑποτίθεται* codd.
[2] *τὰς* inseruit Usener.

The arguments are full of feeling, and the language does not distract the listener from them. The composition is euphonious and the figures of speech are suited to the subject. These are the speeches of Thucydides which should be emulated, and it is from these that I suggest writers of history should select their models for imitation.

I do not approve of the whole of Pericles's speech in the second book, the one which he composed in his own defence when the Athenians were angry with him for persuading them to embark upon the war; nor again of the debate between Cleon and Diodotus about Mytilene in the third book,[1] or the speech of Hermocrates the Syracusan to the men of Camarina,[2] or the reply to it by the Athenian envoy Euphemus,[3] or of others like these (I need not enumerate all that are composed in the same stylistic vein). But to prevent anyone from thinking that I am making statements which cannot be substantiated, I shall, in the interests of brevity, be content to furnish two from a large number of possible examples—Pericles's defence and Hermocrates's indictment of the Athenians before the men of Camarina. 43 430 B.C. 427 B.C. 414 B.C.

These are Pericles's words:[4] 44

"Not only was I expecting this outburst of indignation against me (because I perceive the reasons for it), but I actually summoned a meeting of the assembly for the express purpose of reminding you of your decisions and of reproving you for your inconsiderate anger and your inconstancy in the face of misfortune."

[1] iii. 37–40.
[2] vi. 76–80.
[3] vi. 82–87.
[4] ii. 60.

γράφοντι περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐν ἱστορικῷ σχήματι προσήκοντα ἦν, Περικλεῖ δὲ ἀπολογουμένῳ πρὸς ἠρεθισμένον ὄχλον οὐκ ἦν ἐπιτήδεια εἰρῆσθαι, καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ἀρχαῖς τῆς ἀπολογίας, πρὶν ἑτέροις τισὶν ἀπομειλίξασθαι λόγοις τὰς ὀργὰς τῶν εἰκότως ἐπὶ ταῖς συμφοραῖς ἀχθομένων, τετμημένης μὲν ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων τῆς κρατίστης γῆς, πολλοῦ δὲ κατὰ τὸν λοιμὸν ἀπολωλότος ὄχλου, τὴν δ' αἰτίαν τῶν κακῶν τούτων τοῦ πολέμου παρεσχηκότος, ὃν ὑπ' ἐκείνου πεισθέντες ἀνεδέξαντο. σχῆμά τε οὐ τοῦτο τῇ διανοίᾳ πρεπωδέστατον ἦν, τὸ ἐπιτιμητικόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ παραιτητικόν· οὐ γὰρ ἐρεθίζειν προσήκει [1] τὰς τῶν ὄχλων ὀργὰς τοὺς δημηγοροῦντας ἀλλὰ πραΰνειν. τούτοις ἐπιτίθησι διάνοιαν ἀληθῆ μὲν καὶ δεινῶς ἀπηγγελμένην, οὐ μέντοι γε τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ χρησίμην· "ἐγὼ γὰρ ἡγοῦμαι" φησί "πόλιν πλείω ξύμπασαν ὀρθουμένην ὠφελεῖν τοὺς ἰδιώτας ἢ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν πολιτῶν εὐπραγοῦσαν, ἀθρόαν δὲ σφαλλομένην. καλῶς μὲν γὰρ φερόμενος ἀνὴρ τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸν διαφθειρομένης τῆς πατρίδος οὐδὲν ἧσσον ξυναπόλλυται, κακοτυχῶν δὲ ἐν εὐτυχούσῃ πολλῷ μᾶλλον διασῴζεται." εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἰδίᾳ τινὲς ἐβλάπτοντο τῶν πολιτῶν, εὐτύχει δὲ τὸ κοινόν, καλῶς ⟨ἂν⟩ [2] ταῦτ' ἔλεγεν· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις συμφοραῖς ἦσαν ἅπαντες, οὐκετι καλῶς. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐλπίς, ὅτι ταῦτα πρὸς ἀγαθοῦ τῇ πόλει γενήσεται τὰ δεινά, βέβαιον εἶχέν τι· ἀφανὲς γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ μέλλον καὶ πρὸς τὰ

[1] προσήκει Reiske: προσῆκε codd.
[2] ἂν inseruit Sadée.

These would have been suitable words for Thucydides to use in a historical statement about Pericles, but they are not appropriate words to put in his mouth when he is defending himself before an incensed crowd, especially at the beginning of his speech, before he has said something else to appease their anger. For they have good reason to be vexed at their plight: their best land has been laid waste by the Lacedaemonians, and a large number of them have perished in the plague; and the cause of these disasters is the war which they undertook on his advice. The best manner of address for his purpose would have been, not this reproachful one, but rather a more conciliatory one: political speakers should soothe, not inflame the anger of crowds. He follows this with a statement which is true and strikingly expressed, but is certainly not applicable to the current situation:[1]

"I consider it better for private persons themselves that the state as a whole should flourish than fare well in its individuals but suffer as a whole; for if a private man's country is destroyed, however successful he may be in his own affairs, he nevertheless is destroyed with her; whereas an unfortunate citizen in a fortunate state has a far better chance of survival."

If the citizens were suffering private hardship, but the state enjoying good fortune, this would be an effective argument. But as all were in the direst straits, it loses its point. Nor did the future hold much assurance that these sufferings would be for the benefit of the city: for the future is unrevealed to

[1] ii. 60. 2.

παρόντα τὰς περὶ τῶν ἐσομένων γνώμας αἱ τύχαι τρέπουσι. Τούτοις ἐπιτίθησιν ἔτι φορτικωτέραν διάνοιαν καὶ ἥκιστα τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ πρέπουσαν· "καίτοι ἐμοὶ τοιούτῳ ἀνδρὶ ὀργίζεσθε, ὃς οὐδενὸς οἴομαι ἧσσων εἶναι γνῶναί τε τὰ δέοντα καὶ ἑρμηνεῦσαι ταῦτα, φιλόπολίς τε καὶ χρημάτων κρείσσων." θαυμαστὸν γάρ, εἰ Περικλῆς ὁ μέγιστος τῶν τότε ῥητόρων ἠγνόει τοῦτο, ὃ μηδεὶς ἂν τῶν ἐχόντων μέτριον νοῦν ἠγνόησεν, ὅτι παντα χῇ μὲν οἱ μὴ τεταμιευμένως ἐπαινοῦντες τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀρετὰς ἐπαχθεῖς τοῖς ἀκούουσι φαίνονται, μάλιστα δ' ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὰ δικαστήρια καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἀγῶσιν, ἐν οἷς γε δὴ μὴ περὶ τιμῶν αὐτοῖς ἐστιν ἀλλὰ περὶ τιμωριῶν ὁ κίνδυνος· τότε γὰρ οὐκ ἐπαχθεῖς μόνον εἰσὶν ἑτέροις, ἀλλὰ καὶ δυστυχεῖς ἑαυτοῖς ἐκκαλούμενοι τὸν παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν φθόνον· ὅταν δὲ τοὺς αὐτούς τις ἔχῃ δικαστάς τε καὶ κατηγόρους, μυρίων αὐτῷ δεῖ δακρύων τε καὶ οἰκτων εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο πρῶτον τὸ μετ' εὐνοίας ἀκουσθῆναι. ὁ δὲ δημαγωγὸς οὐκ ἀρκεῖται τούτοις ἀλλ' ἐπεξεργάζεταί τε τούτοις καὶ μεταφράζει τὰ ῥηθέντα· "ὅ τε γὰρ γενούς" φησί "καὶ μὴ σαφῶς διδάξας ἐν ἴσῳ καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐνεθυμήθη, ὅ τ' ἔχων ἀμφότερα, τῇ δὲ πόλει δύσνους οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως τι οἰκείως φράζοι· προσόντος δὲ καὶ τοῦδε,

[1] ii. 60. 5.

man, and fortune makes us adapt our expectations of things to come to present realities.

He follows this with an even more banal statement 45
and one not at all appropriate to the crisis of the moment:[1]

"Yet I, the man with whom you are angry, am as capable, I believe, as any of devising and explaining a sound policy; and I am, moreover, patriotic and incorruptible."

It would be remarkable if Pericles, the greatest orator of his day, did not know what every man of average intelligence must have known, that while in all orations speakers who praise their own virtues without restraint invariably exasperate their audiences, this is especially so when they are on trial in the law-courts or in the assembly, where they face the prospect not of loss of prestige but of actual punishment. In such circumstances they not only annoy others but also bring misfortune upon themselves by evoking the hatred of the populace; but in cases where the jury and prosecution are one and the same, a defendant needs to arm himself with oceans of tears and pleas for pity in order to achieve this very objective of a favourable hearing from the start. But our popular leader is not satisfied with these words, but elaborates on them and puts what he has already said into different words:[2]

"Now a man who has formed a plan," he says "but has not expounded it clearly might as well have thought of no plan at all; or, if he possessed both ability and eloquence, but had not the city's good at heart, he could not express himself suitably; and if he had patriotism, too, but were not indifferent to

[2] ii. 60. 6.

χρήμασι δὲ νικωμένου, τὰ ξύμπαντα τούτου ἑνὸς ἂν πωλοῖτο." οὐκ οἶδ' ὅς τις ἂν ὁμολογήσειεν, ὥσπερ ἀληθῆ ταῦτα ἦν, οὕτως καὶ προσήκοντα εἶναι ὑπὸ Περικλέους ἐν Ἀθηναίοις ἠρεθισμένοις πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγεσθαι. ἦν δέ γε οὐχ ἡ τῶν κρατίστων ἐνθυμημάτων τε καὶ νοημάτων εὕρεσις αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἀξία σπουδῆς, εἰ μὴ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν εἴη προσήκοντα καὶ τοῖς προσώποις καὶ τοῖς καιροῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ [1] καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἔφην, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γνώμην ἀποδεικνύμενος ὁ συγγραφεύς, ἣν εἶχε περὶ τῆς Περικλέους ἀρετῆς, παρὰ τόπον ἔοικεν εἰρηκέναι ταῦτα. ἐχρῆν δέ γε αὐτὸν μὲν ὅ τι βούλεται περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀποφαίνεσθαι, τῷ δὲ κινδυνεύοντι τοὺς ταπεινοὺς καὶ παραιτητικοὺς τῆς ὀργῆς ἀποδοῦναι λόγους· τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν πρέπον τῷ μιμεῖσθαι βουλομένῳ συγγραφεῖ τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

46 Ὀχληρὰ δὲ κἀκεῖνα τὰ μειρακιώδη καλλωπίσματα τῆς λέξεως καὶ τὰ πολύπλοκα τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων σχήματα· [2] "ἰέναι δὲ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὁμόσε καὶ ἀμύνεσθαι μὴ φρονήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι. φρόνημα μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀμαθίας εὐτυχοῦς καὶ δειλῷ τινι ἐγγίγνεται· καταφρόνησις δέ, ὃς ἂν καὶ γνώμῃ πιστεύῃ τῶν ἐναντίων προέχειν· ὃ ἡμῖν ὑπάρχει. καὶ τὴν τόλμαν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμοίας τύχης ἡ σύνεσις ἐκ τοῦ ὑπέρφρονος ὀχυρωτέραν παρέχεται· ἐλπίδι τε ἧσσον πιστεύει, ἧς ἐν τῷ ἀπόρῳ ἡ ἰσχύς· γνώμῃ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, ἧς βεβαιοτέρα ἡ πρόνοια." τά τε γὰρ "φρονή-

[1] *ὥσπερ* Sadée: *ὅπερ* codd.
[2] *σχήματα* Krüger: *ὀνόματα* codd.

bribery, all his good qualities could be sold for money alone."

No one, I suppose, will deny the truth of this statement; but equally no one would suggest that it was a suitable one for Pericles, speaking before an angry audience of Athenians, to make to their faces. The invention of the most potent arguments is not to be admired for its own sake, unless they be appropriate to the characters, the situation, and all other relevant factors. But as I said at the beginning,[1] the historian seems to have used these words, in which he is expressing his own opinion regarding the ability of Pericles, in the wrong context. He was quite entitled to describe the statesman's qualities as he pleased, but as a defendant Pericles should have been made to speak humbly and in such a manner as to turn away the jury's anger. This would have been the proper procedure for a historian who sought to imitate real life.

Tiresome also are the juvenile embellishments of 46
language and the intricately constructed arguments of this passage:[2]

"You must confront your enemies therefore not only with spirit but in a spirit of scorn. Spirit can even be the result of lucky folly, and occur in a coward; but rational scorn belongs only to the man who trusts his judgment that he is superior to his enemies; which is our position. When fortune is impartial, intelligence based on a spirit of superiority makes courage more unshakable: it relies not so much on hope, which is effective in extremity, as on judgment based upon fact, whose foresight is more dependable."

[1] ch. 44 *init.* [2] ii. 62. 3.

ματα" ψυχρότερά ἐστι καὶ τῆς Γοργίου προαιρέσεως μᾶλλον οἰκειότερα, ἥ τε τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐξήγησις ἀμφότερον [1] σοφιστικὴ καὶ ἀπειρόκαλος· ἥ τε τόλμα ἣν "ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμοίας τύχης ἡ σύνεσις ἐκ τοῦ ὑπέρφρονος ὀχυρωτέραν παρέχεται" τῶν Ἡρακλειτείων σκοτεινῶν ἀσαφεστέραν ἔχει τὴν δήλωσιν, ἥ τε τῆς ἐλπίδος "ἐν τῷ ἀπόρῳ ἰσχύς" καὶ ἡ τῆς γνώμης "ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων βεβαιοτέρα πρόνοια" ποιητικώτερον περιπέφρασται· βούλεται γὰρ λέγειν, ὅτι δεῖ τῇ γνώμῃ πιστεύειν μᾶλλον, ἣν ἐκ τῶν παρόντων λαμβάνομεν, ἢ ταῖς
47 ἐλπίσιν, ὧν ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι [2] ἐστὶν ἡ ἰσχύς. ἤδη δ' ἔγωγε κἀκεῖνο ἐνεθυμήθην, ὅτι παραμυθούμενος τὴν ὀργὴν τὴν κατειληφυῖαν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς παρούσαις συμφοραῖς, ὧν αἱ πλείους παράλογοί τε συνέβησαν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀπροσδόκητοι, καὶ παρακαλῶν τὰς συμφορὰς γενναίως ὑφίστασθαι μὴ ἀφανίζοντας τὴν τῆς πόλεως ἀξίωσιν, ἀπαλγήσαντας δὲ τὰ ἴδια τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο διεξελθών, ὅτι τὴν κατὰ θάλατταν ἀρχὴν βεβαίως ἔχοντες οὔτε ὑπὸ βασιλέως οὔτε ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων οὔτε ὑπ' ἄλλου ἀνθρώπων ἔθνους οὐδενὸς καταλυθήσονται (ὧν ἡ πίστις οὐχ ἡ παροῦσα ἦν ἀλλ' ἡ μέλλουσα, οὐδ' ἐν τῇ προνοίᾳ τὸ βέβαιον ἔχουσα ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἐλπίσιν), ἔπειτα τούτων ἐπιλαθόμενος ἀξιοῖ μὴ πιστεύειν τῇ ἐλπίδι, ἧς ἐν τῷ ἀπόρῳ ἡ ἰσχύς. ἐναντία γὰρ δὴ ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις, εἴ γε δὴ τὸ μὲν

[1] ἀμφότερον Reiske: ἀμφοτέρων codd.
[2] τῷ μέλλοντι Sadée: τῷ μέλλειν codd.

The word-play on "spirit" is rather frigid, and closer to the Gorgianic style, and the definitions of the nouns both sophistical and lacking in taste. "Courage," which "when fortune is impartial, is rendered more unshakable by an intelligence based on a spirit of superiority," is more puzzling to explain than the dark sayings of Heraclitus,[1] and the definition of "hope" as "effective in extremity" and of "judgment" as that whose "foresight is more dependable when based on fact," are circumlocutions of a rather poetical character. What he means to say is that one should put more trust in knowledge, which is based upon present circumstances, than upon hopes, whose power lies in the future.

It has also just occurred to me that after trying to 47
soothe the anger which has seized them on account of their present misfortunes, most of which had come upon them unforeseen and unexpected, and exhorting them to endure these misfortunes nobly, and not to efface the city's fame but to forget private sorrows and strive for the common safety; after this, when he has explained that if they maintain their maritime empire securely, neither the King of Persia nor the Lacedaemonians nor any other people in the world will overthrow them (the proof of which is not in the present but in the future, and depends not upon foresight but upon hopes), he forgets these arguments and says that they should not rely upon hope, which is effective in extremities. Of course, these sentiments are mutually contradictory, if in fact they were already experiencing the sufferings in question, whereas

[1] The famous Ephesian philosopher (fl. *c.* 500 B.C.), whose opinions are preserved in a large collection of aphoristic statements, many of them of doubtful interpretation.

λυποῦν τὴν αἴσθησιν εἶχεν ἤδη παροῦσαν, τῆς δ' ὠφελείας ἡ δήλωσις ἔτι ἀπῆν.

ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐπαινῶ οὔτε κατὰ τὸ πραγματικὸν μέρος οὔτε κατὰ τὸ λεκτικόν, οὕτως ἐκεῖνα τεθαύμακα ὡς νενοημένα τε ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἡρμηνευμένα περιττῶς καὶ συγκείμενα ἡδέως· "καὶ γὰρ οἷς μὲν αἵρεσις γεγένηται τὰ ἄλλα εὐτυχοῦσι, πολλὴ ἄνοια πολεμῆσαι· εἰ δ' ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἢ εἴξαντας εὐθὺς τοῖς πέλας ὑπακοῦσαι ἢ κινδυνεύσαντας περιγενέσθαι, ὁ φυγὼν τὸν κίνδυνον τοῦ ὑποστάντος μεμπτότερος· καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν ὁ αὐτός εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἐξίσταμαι, ὑμεῖς δὲ μεταβάλλετε, ἐπειδὴ ξυνέβη ὑμῖν πεισθῆναι μὲν ἀκεραίοις, μεταμέλειν δὲ κακουμένοις." καὶ ἔτι ἐκεῖνα· "δουλοῖ γὰρ φρόνημα τὸ αἰφνίδιον καὶ τὸ ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ τὸ πλείστῳ παραλόγῳ ξυμβαῖνον· ⟨ὃ ὑμῖν πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐχ ἥκιστα καὶ κατὰ τὴν νόσον γεγένηται⟩.[1] ὅμως δὲ πόλιν μεγάλην οἰκοῦντας καὶ ἐν ἤθεσιν ἀντιπάλοις αὐτῇ τεθραμμένους χρεὼν καὶ τὰς συμφορὰς ἐθέλειν ὑφίστασθαι καὶ τὴν ἀξίωσιν μὴ ἀφανίζειν· ἐν ἴσῳ γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι δικαιοῦσι τῆς τε ὑπαρχούσης δόξης αἰτιᾶσθαι, ὅστις ἂν μαλακίᾳ ἐλλείπῃ, καὶ τῆς μὴ προσηκούσης μισεῖν τὸν θρασύτητι ὀρεγόμενον." καὶ ἔτι τὰ διεγείροντα τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ τὸ φρόνημα τὸ πάτριον ταυτί· "τῆς τε πόλεως ὑμᾶς εἰκὸς τῷ τιμωμένῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχειν,

[1] ὁ—γεγένηται ex Thucydide inserui.

[1] ii. 61. 1.

there was as yet no clear indication that assistance was to come.

But just as in this passage I do not commend the subject-matter or the style, so I admire the earlier passage for the precision of its thought, the forcefulness of its expression, and the pleasing character of its composition:[1]

"For those who have the choice and are prosperous otherwise, it is very foolish to make war. But when they must either submit and be subject to their neighbour, or risk all for survival, then he who shuns, not he who meets the danger, is the more culpable. For myself, my position is the same and I do not move from it; but you are changing your ground: you were persuaded when you were unharmed, but change your minds under suffering."

I also admire:[2]

"Anything which is sudden and unexpected and completely incalculable subdues the spirit of man; and this has been your particular fate with regard to the plague. Nevertheless, being citizens of a great city and brought up under customs which match its greatness, you should be willing to endure calamities and not to efface her fame. For while it is felt to be justifiable to hate the presumption of those who claim a reputation to which they have no right, it is thought to be no less so to condemn the faint-heartedness of those who do not live up to their reputation."

And the following exhortation, designed to arouse the hearts of the Athenians to patriotic feelings:[3]

"Again, you should uphold the imperial dignity of

[2] ii. 61. 3.
[3] ii. 63.

ὦ ὑπὲρ ἅπαντας ἀγάλλεσθε, βοηθεῖν καὶ μὴ φεύγειν τοὺς πόνους, ἢ μηδὲ τὰς τιμὰς διώκειν· μηδὲ νομίσαι περὶ ἑνὸς μόνου, δουλείας ἀντ' ἐλευθερίας, ἀγωνίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρχῆς στερήσεως καὶ κινδύνου ὧν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ ἀπήχθεσθε. ἧς οὐδ' ἐκστῆναι ἔτι ὑμῖν ἔστιν, εἴ τις καὶ τόδε ἐν τῷ παρόντι δεδιὼς ἀπραγμοσύνῃ ἀνδραγαθίζεται. ὡς τυραννίδα γὰρ ἤδη ἔχετε αὐτήν, ἣν λαβεῖν μὲν ἄδικον δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἀφεῖναι δὲ ἐπικίνδυνον," καὶ τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια, ὅσα τάς τε ἐξαλλαγὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν σχημάτων μετρίας ἔχει καὶ οὔτε περιέργους οὔτε δυσπαρακολουθήτους.

48 Ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἑρμοκράτους δημηγορίας ἐπαινεῖν μὲν ἔχω ταῦτα τὰ κατορθώματα τοῦ συγγραφέως· "ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὴν Ἀθηναίων εὐκατηγόρητον οὖσαν πόλιν νῦν ἥκομεν ἀποφανοῦντες ἐν εἰδόσιν, ὅσα ἀδικεῖ· πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς αἰτιασόμενοι, ὅτι ἔχοντες παραδείγματα τῶν ἐκεῖ Ἑλλήνων, ὡς ἐδουλώθησαν οὐκ ἀμύνοντες σφίσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ νῦν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὰ αὐτὰ παρόντα σοφίσματα, Λεοντίνων τε ξυγγενῶν κατοικίσεις καὶ Αἰγεσταίων ξυμμάχων ἐπικουρίας, οὐ ξυστραφέντες βουλόμεθα προθυμότερον δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐκ Ἴωνες ταῦτά εἰσιν οὐδὲ Ἑλλησπόντιοι καὶ νησιῶται, οἳ δεσπότην ἢ Μῆδον ἢ ἕνα γέ τινα ἀεὶ μεταβάλλοντες δουλοῦνται, ἀλλὰ Δωριεῖς ἐλεύθεροι ἀπ' αὐτονόμου τῆς Πελοποννήσου τὴν Σικελίαν οἰκοῦντες. ἢ

[1] vi. 77.

your city, in which you take pride above all others, by not shunning hardships; otherwise you should not seek a share in her glory either. And do not imagine that you are fighting about a single issue, freedom or slavery: you have an empire to lose, and there is also the danger to which the hatred of your empire has exposed you. And it is no longer possible for you even to resign your power, in case anyone is persuaded by present fear to act the brave man's part—and do nothing. For by this time your empire has become like a tyranny, which men regard as wrong to seize, but dangerous to let go."

I admire these and similar passages, in which unusual words and figures of speech are used discreetly, without complication and without obscurity.

From the speech which the historian assigns to 48
Hermocrates I can commend the following effective passages:[1]

"But we have not now come to demonstrate that the Athenian state is open to accusation, before an audience which knows about its misdeeds. Our purpose is much more to blame ourselves: for though we have examples from among the Greeks in the East of states which have been enslaved because they did not stand by one another, and now see the same tricks being used against us, as we hear of the restoration of the Leontines, who are called "kinsmen," and of aid being brought to the Egestaeans, who are called "allies," yet we are not more ready to combine and show them that here are no Ionians, Hellespontines or Islanders, who live in permanent servitude to one master or another, whether he be a tyrant, or a Mede, or anyone else, but free Dorians from the independent land of the Peloponnese who

μένομεν, ἕως ἂν ἕκαστοι κατὰ πόλεις ληφθῶμεν, εἰδότες ὅτι ταύτῃ μόνον ἁλωτοί ἐσμεν;" ταῦτα γὰρ ἐν τῷ σαφεῖ καὶ καθαρῷ τῆς διαλέκτου τρόπῳ λεγόμενα προσείληφε καὶ τὸ τάχος καὶ τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὸν τόνον καὶ τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ τὴν δεινότητα, καὶ πάθους ἐστὶν ἐναγωνίου μεστά· οἷς ἂν καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ χρήσαιτό τις καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις, καὶ φίλοις διαλεγόμενος. καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἐκεῖνα· "εἴ τέ τις φθονεῖ μὲν ἢ καὶ φοβεῖται (ἀμφότερα γὰρ τάδε πάσχει τὰ μείζω), διὰ δ' αὐτὰ τὰς Συρακοὺσας κακωθῆναι μέν, ἵνα σωφρονισθῶμεν, βούλεται, περιγενέσθαι δὲ ἕνεκα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀσφαλείας, οὐκ ἀνθρωπείας δυνάμεως βούλησιν ἐλπίζει. οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἅμα τῆς τε ἐπιθυμίας καὶ τῆς τύχης τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμοίως ταμίαν γενέσθαι," καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τελευτῇ κείμενα τοῦ λόγου· "δεόμεθα οὖν καὶ μαρτυρόμεθα, εἰ μὴ πείσομεν, ὅτι ἐπιβουλευόμεθα μὲν ὑπὸ Ἰώνων ἀεὶ πολεμίων, προδιδόμεθα δὲ ὑφ' ὑμῶν Δωριεῖς Δωριέων· καὶ εἰ καταστρέψονται ἡμᾶς Ἀθηναῖοι, ταῖς μὲν ὑμετέραις γνώμαις κρατήσουσι, τῷ δ' αὑτῶν ὀνόματι τιμηθήσονται, καὶ τῆς νίκης οὐκ ἄλλον τινὰ ἆθλον ἢ τὸν τὴν νίκην παρασχόντα λήψονται." ταῦτα μὲν δὴ καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια τούτοις καλὰ καὶ ζήλου ἄξια ἡγοῦμαι. ἐκεῖνα δ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἂν ἐπαινέσαιμι· "νῦν γὰρ εἰς τὴν Σικελίαν προφάσει μέν, ᾗ πυνθάνεσθε, διανοίᾳ δέ, ἣν πάντες

[1] vi. 78. 2.

dwell in Sicily. Are we going to wait until our cities are taken one by one, when we know that this is the only way in which we can be conquered? "

In addition to being expressed in clear and pure language, this passage has rapid movement, beauty, intensity, impressiveness and rhetorical brilliance, and is full of vehement emotion: qualities which a speaker might employ in the law-courts, in public meetings and in conversations with his friends. Then there is the following passage:[1]

" And if anyone envies and even fears us (for superior power is exposed to both), and so wants Syracuse to be damaged so that we may be taught a lesson, but to survive for his own safety's sake, he is hoping for the fulfilment of a wish which human power cannot grant; for it is not possible for the same person at the same time to control similarly both his desire and his fortune."

And the concluding passage of the speech:[2]

" So we entreat you and, if we fail to persuade you, we call you to witness that, although the Ionians, our perpetual enemies, are conspiring against us, it is you, Dorians like ourselves, who are betraying us; and if the Athenians conquer us, your decision will have gained them the day, but the honour will be all their own, and the prize of their victory will be none other than the agents who made it possible."

This and similar passages I consider fine and worthy of imitation. But I cannot bring myself to praise this:[3]

" Now they have now come to Sicily on a pretext which you can all understand, but with an intention

[2] vi. 80. 3.
[3] vi. 76. 2.

ὑπονοοῦμεν. καί μοι δοκοῦσιν οὐ Λεοντίνους βούλεσθαι κατοικίσαι, ἀλλ' ἡμᾶς μᾶλλον ἐξοικίσαι." ψυχρὰ γὰρ ἡ παρονομασία καὶ οὐ προσβάλλουσα πάθος, ἀλλ' ἐπιτήδευσιν. καὶ ἔτι τὰ πεπλεγμένα καὶ πολλὰς τὰς ἕλικας ἔχοντα σχήματα ταυτί· "καὶ οὐ περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἄρα οὔτε οἵδε τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε οἱ Ἕλληνες τῆς ἑαυτῶν τῷ Μήδῳ ἀντέστησαν, περὶ δὲ τοῦ, οἳ μὲν σφίσιν ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐκείνῳ καταδουλώσεως, οἳ δ' ἐπὶ δεσπότου μεταβολῇ οὐκ ἀξυνετωτέρου, κακοξυνετωτέρου δέ." καὶ ἔτι τὸ κατακορὲς τῆς μεταγωγῆς ⟨τῆς⟩[1] ἔκ τε τοῦ πληθυντικοῦ εἰς τὸ ἑνικὸν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ προσώπων λόγου εἰς τὸ τοῦ λέγοντος πρόσωπον· "καὶ εἴ τῳ ἄρα παρέστηκε τὸν μὲν Συρακόσιον, ἑαυτὸν δ' οὐ πολέμιον εἶναι τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ καὶ δεινὸν ἡγεῖται ὑπέρ γε τῆς ἐμῆς κινδυνεύειν, ἐνθυμηθήτω οὐ περὶ τῆς ἐμῆς μᾶλλον, ἐν ἴσῳ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἅμα ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ μαχόμενος, τοσούτῳ δὲ καὶ ἀσφαλέστερον, ὅσῳ οὐ προδιεφθαρμένου ἐμοῦ, ἔχων δὲ ξύμμαχον ἐμὲ καὶ οὐκ ἔρημος ἀγωνιεῖται· τόν τε Ἀθηναῖον μὴ τὴν τοῦ Συρακοσίου ἔχθραν κολάσασθαι, ⟨τῇ δ' ἐμῇ προφάσει τὴν ἐκείνου δουλείαν βεβαιώσασθαι βούλεσθαι⟩. [2] ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ μειρακιώδη καὶ περίεργα καὶ τῶν λεγομένων αἰνιγμάτων ἀσαφέστερα. καὶ ἐκεῖνα ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις· "καὶ εἰ γνώμῃ ἁμάρτοι, τοῖς αὑτοῦ κακοῖς ὀλοφυρθεὶς τάχ' ἂν ἴσως καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ποτε βουληθείη αὖθις φθονῆσαι·

[1] *τῆς* inseruit Usener.

[2] *τῇ δ' ἐμῇ προφάσει τὴν ἐκείνου δουλείαν βεβαιώσασθαι βούλεσθαι* inserui ex Thucydide.

which we all suspect. In my view they want not to repopulate Leontini, but rather to depopulate Sicily."

The word-play is frigid, conveying not emotion but artificiality. The same applies to the following complicated structure with its many convolutions:[1]

"It was not for freedom that they opposed the Persian king, neither these for the freedom of Greece nor the Greeks for that of themselves, but the former with a view to enslavement, and the latter with a view to a change of master, not more imprudent but more impudent."

And again, the wearisome substitution of singular for plural and the change from other persons to the speaker's own person in the following:[2]

"If anyone has reflected that not he, but the Syracusan, is the enemy of the Athenian, and objects to risking his life for my country, let him consider that he will not really be fighting for my country any more than fighting in mine for his own, and with less danger, because I shall not have been destroyed already, but he will have me as an ally and will not be fighting alone; and that the Athenian intends not so much to punish the Syracusan's hostility ⟨as to use me as a pretext to secure the friendship of the Camarinians⟩."

This is juvenile and overdone, and is more obscure than what we call riddles. So too with this sentence:[3]

"And if he should make an error of judgment, after lamenting our own misfortunes he may perhaps wish that he may still have my prosperity to envy; but he

[1] vi. 76. 4.
[2] vi. 78. 1.
[3] vi. 78. 3.

ἀδύνατον δὲ προεμένῳ καὶ μὴ τοὺς αὐτοὺς κινδύνους οὐ περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν ἔργων ἐθελήσαντι προσλαβεῖν." οἷς ἐπιτίθησιν οὐδὲ μειρακίῳ προσῆκον ἐπιφώνημα· "λόγῳ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἡμετέραν δύναμιν σώζοι ἄν τις, ἔργῳ δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίαν."

49 Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐν τῇ δημηγορίᾳ ταύτῃ μέμψεως ἄξια, περὶ ὧν οὐδὲν δέομαι τὰ πλείω λέγειν· ἱκανῶς δ' οἴομαι καὶ διὰ τούτων φανερὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ προκείμενον, ὅτι τῆς Θουκυδίδου λέξεως κρατίστη μέν ἐστιν ἡ μετρίως ἐκβεβηκυῖα τὰ συνήθη καὶ τὰς πρώτας καὶ ἀναγκαίας ἀρετὰς φυλάσσουσα, χείρων δὲ ἡ λαμβάνουσα πολλὴν ἐκτροπὴν ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν ὀνομάτων τε καὶ σχημάτων εἰς τὰ ξένα καὶ βεβιασμένα καὶ ἀνακολούθητα, δι' ἣν οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν οὐδεμίαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδείκνυνται δύναμιν. οὔτε γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις χρήσιμοί ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ γένος τῆς φράσεως, ἐν αἷς ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης καὶ πολέμου καὶ νόμων εἰσφορᾶς καὶ πολιτειῶν κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κοινῶν καὶ μεγάλων αἱ πόλεις βουλευσόμεναι συνέρχονται, οὔτ' ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις, ἔνθα περὶ θανάτου καὶ φυγῆς καὶ ἀτιμίας καὶ δεσμῶν καὶ χρημάτων ἀφαιρέσεως οἱ λόγοι πρὸς τοὺς ἀνειληφότας τὴν ὑπὲρ τούτων ἐξουσίαν λέγονται (⟨καὶ γὰρ αἱ τοιαῦται ῥητορεῖ⟩αι[1] λυποῦσι τὸν πολιτικὸν ὄχλον οὐκ ὄντα τῶν τοιούτων ἀκουσμάτων ἐν ἔθει), οὔτ' ἐν ταῖς ἰδιωτικαῖς ὁμιλίαις, ἐν αἷς περὶ τῶν βιωτικῶν διαλεγόμεθα πολίταις ἢ φίλοις ἢ συγγενέσιν διηγούμενοί τι τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἑαυτοῖς ἢ

cannot bring me back again once he has abandoned me and refused to accept his share of a common danger which, far from being imaginary, is only too real."

And this is followed by an utterance which one would not expect even from a callow youth:

"For though in name you may be saving us, in reality you will be saving yourselves."

There are other things in this speech that deserve 49
censure, but there is no need for me to spend further words on them. I think that the above examples illustrate clearly enough my thesis, that Thucydides's style is at its best when it does not depart unduly from normality, and preserves the primary and essential virtues; but that it is less good when it admits much divergence from common vocabulary and figures to strange, forced and inconsequent ones, since this prevents any one of its other virtues from displaying its effect. It serves no useful purpose to employ this manner of address in public assemblies, where citizens come together to deliberate on questions of peace and war, on legislation and on the ordering of the constitution, and other important matters of common concern. Nor is it suited to the law-courts, where the issues include death, exile, disfranchisement, imprisonment, and confiscation of property, and the audience is a jury empowered to impose these penalties: ⟨for such displays of rhetoric⟩ antagonise the average citizen body, which is not accustomed to hear that sort of thing. And it is not suitable for private conversations, in which we discuss everyday matters with fellow-citizens, friends or relations,

[1] implevi lacunam Usenerum secutus.

συμβουλευόμενοι περί τινος τῶν ἀναγκαίων, ἢ νουθετοῦντες ἢ παρακαλοῦντες ἢ συνηδόμενοι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἢ συναλγοῦντες τοῖς κακοῖς· ἐῶ γὰρ λέγειν, ὅτι τῶν οὕτως διαλεγομένων οὐδὲ αἱ μητέρες ἂν καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἀνάσχοιντο διὰ τὴν ἀηδίαν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἀλλοεθνοῦς γλώσσης ἀκούοντες τῶν ἑρμηνευσόντων ἂν δεηθεῖεν. ταῦτα ἔστιν ἃ περὶ τοῦ συγγραφέως ἐπείσθην, μετὰ πάσης ἀληθείας εἰρημένα κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν δύναμιν.

50 Ἀνάγκη δὲ καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τισιν ἐξετάσαι δι' ὀλίγων,[1] ἵνα μηδὲν παρεικέναι δοκῶ. ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὔτ' εἰς τοὺς πολιτικοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐπιτήδειός ἐστιν οὔτ' εἰς τὰς ὁμιλίας τὰς ἰδιωτικὰς[2] οὗτος ὁ χαρακτήρ, ἅπαντες ὁμολογήσουσιν οἱ μὴ διεφθαρμένοι τὴν διάνοιαν ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατὰ φύσιν τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἔχοντες. ἐπιχειροῦσι δέ τινες οὐκ ἄδοξοι σοφισταὶ λέγειν, ὅτι τοῖς μὲν πρὸς τὰς ὀχλικὰς ἐντεύξεις παρεσκευασμένοις καὶ τὰ δίκαια λέγουσιν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιτήδειος οὗτος ὁ χαρακτήρ, τοῖς δὲ τὰς ἱστορικὰς πραγματείας ἐκφέρουσιν, αἷς μεγαλοπρεπείας τε δεῖ καὶ σεμνολογίας καὶ καταπλήξεως, παντὸς μάλιστα προσήκει ταύτην ἀσκεῖν τὴν φράσιν τὴν γλωττηματικήν τε καὶ ἀπηρχαιωμένην καὶ τροπικὴν καὶ ἐξηλλαγμένην τῶν ἐν ἔθει σχημάτων ἐπὶ τὸ ξένον καὶ περιττόν. οὐ γὰρ ἀγοραίοις ἀνθρώποις οὐδ' ἐπιδιφρίοις ἢ χειροτέχναις οὐδὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις οἳ μὴ μετέσχον ἀγωγῆς ἐλευθερίου ταύτας κατασκευάζεσθαι τὰς γραφάς, ἀλλ' ἀνδράσι διὰ τῶν ἐγκυκλίων μαθημάτων ἐπὶ ῥητορικήν τε ⟨καὶ⟩ φιλοσοφίαν ἐληλυθόσιν, οἷς οὐδὲν φανήσεται τούτων ξένον. ἤδη

describing some experience of ours, considering some urgent problem, giving advice or asking for help, and sharing other men's joys and sorrows. I shall pass over the fact that if people spoke like this, not even their fathers or mothers could bear the unpleasantness of listening to them: they would need an interpreter, as if they were listening to a foreign tongue. These are the convictions I have formed about the historian. I have stated them with complete candour, and to the best of my ability.

I must also briefly examine certain other views 50
about Thucydides, so that it may not be thought that I have omitted anything. That his style is not suitable for political debates or private conversations will be admitted by all men whose judgment is unimpaired and who have their natural powers of perception. But certain quite reputable critics try to argue that, although this style is not suitable for an orator intending to address a popular audience, or for a litigant, those who are producing a work of history, which requires an impressive, dignified and striking style, should find Thucydides's recondite, archaic, figurative language, which diverges from normality towards the novel and the extravagant, eminently appropriate to employ. They contend that the author was not composing these writings of his for the man in the street, the workman at the bench, the artisan or any other person who has not enjoyed a liberal education, but for those who have passed through the standard courses to the study of rhetoric and philosophy, to whom none of these usages will seem strange. And

---

[1] δι' ὀλίγων Reiske: διὰ λόγων codd.
[2] ἰδιωτικὰς Sadée: βιωτικὰς codd.

δέ τινες ἐπεχείρησαν λέγειν, ὡς οὐ τῶν μεθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐσομένων στοχαζόμενος ὁ συγγραφεὺς οὕτως ἔγραψε τὰς ἱστορίας, ἀλλὰ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὄντων, οἷς ἦν ἡ διάλεκτος ⟨αὕτη συνήθης καὶ γνώριμος ἅπασιν⟩ . . .[1] χρήσιμος οὗτος ὁ χαρακτὴρ οὔτ' εἰς τοὺς συμβουλευτικοὺς ⟨οὔτ' εἰς τοὺς δικανικοὺς[2] ἀγῶνας, ἐν οἷς οἵ τ' ἐκκλησιάζοντες καὶ οἱ δικάζοντες, οὐχ οἵους ὁ Θουκυδίδης ὑπέθετο, συνέρχονται.

51 Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τοὺς οἰομένους μόνων εἶναι τῶν εὐπαιδεύτων ἀναγνῶναί τε καὶ συνεῖναι τὴν Θουκυδίδου διάλεκτον ταῦτα λέγειν ἔχω, ὅτι τὸ τοῦ πράγματος ἀναγκαῖόν τε καὶ χρήσιμον ἅπασιν (οὐδὲν γὰρ ⟨ἂν⟩[3] ἀναγκαιότερον γένοιτο οὐδὲ πολυωφελέστερον) ἀναιροῦσιν ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ βίου, ὀλίγων παντάπασιν ἀνθρώπων οὕτω ποιοῦντες, ὥσπερ ἐν ταῖς ὀλιγαρχουμέναις ἢ τυραννουμέναις πόλεσιν· εὐαρίθμητοι γάρ τινές εἰσιν οἷοι πάντα τὰ Θουκυδίδου συμβαλεῖν, καὶ οὐδ' οὗτοι χωρὶς ἐξηγήσεως γραμματικῆς ἔνια. πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν ἀρχαῖον βίον ἀναφέροντας τὴν Θουκυδίδου διάλεκτον ὡς δὴ τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις οὖσαν συνήθη, βραχὺς ἀπόχρη μοι λόγος καὶ σαφής, ὅτι πολλῶν γενομένων Ἀθήνησι κατὰ τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον ῥητόρων τε καὶ φιλοσόφων οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν κέχρηται ταύτῃ τῇ διαλέκτῳ, οὔθ'[4] οἱ περὶ Ἀνδοκίδην καὶ Ἀντιφῶντα καὶ Λυσίαν ῥήτορες οὔθ' οἱ περὶ

[1] lacunam a Sylburgo indicatam post διάλεκτος partim explendam αὕτη συνήθης καὶ γνώριμος ἅπασιν . . . esse censeo.
[2] inseruit Sylburg. [3] ἂν inseruit Reiske.
[4] διαλέκτῳ, οὔθ' Krüger: διαλέκτῳ οὐδ' codd.

some have now tried to make out that the historian wrote in this way because he was aiming not at posterity but at his contemporaries, to all of whose ears his language ⟨was familiar and comprehensible⟩. . . . But this style is not suitable for deliberative or forensic oratory, in which the audiences who assemble for political meetings or to serve as jurymen are not such as Thucydides supposed them to be

Now to those who think that Thucydides's lan- 51
guage can be read with understanding only by the well-educated, I have this to say: that in confining it to an extremely small minority of readers, they are removing from ordinary men's lives a necessary and universally useful subject of study (for nothing could be more necessary or more widely beneficial). It becomes the property of a few, like government under an oligarchy or a tyrant; for the number of men who can understand the whole of Thucydides can easily be counted, and even these cannot understand certain passages without a linguistic commentary. But to those who refer Thucydides's language to its historical period and assert that it was familiar to the people of that time, I am content with a short and obvious reply: that none of the many orators and philosophers who lived at Athens during the Peloponnesian War used this style, neither Andocides,[1] Antiphon,[2] Lysias and their fellow orators, nor

[1] Athenian aristocrat, born *c.* 440 B.C. whose three surviving speeches, all written for his own use, show an imperfect but progressively improving knowledge of rhetorical theory. See MacDowell's edition of the *De Mysteriis*.

[2] See note 1, p. 228.

Κριτίαν καὶ Ἀντισθένη καὶ Ξενοφῶντα Σωκρατικοί. ἐκ δὴ τούτων ἁπάντων δῆλός ἐστιν ἀνὴρ πρῶτος ἐπιτετηδευκὼς ταύτην τὴν ἑρμηνείαν, ἵνα διαλλάξῃ τοὺς ἄλλους συγγραφεῖς. ὅταν μὲν οὖν τεταμιευμένως αὐτῇ χρήσηται καὶ μετρίως, θαυμαστός ἐστι καὶ οὐδενὶ συγκριτὸς[1] οὐδ' ἑτέρῳ· ὅταν δὲ κατακόρως καὶ ἀπειροκάλως, μήτε τοὺς καιροὺς διορίζων μήτε τὴν ποσότητα ὁρῶν, μεμπτός. ἐγὼ δὲ οὔτε αὐχμηρὰν καὶ ἀκόσμητον καὶ ἰδιωτικὴν τὴν ἱστορικὴν εἶναι πραγματείαν ἀξιώσαιμ' ἄν, ἀλλ' ἔχουσάν τι καὶ ποιητικόν· οὔτε παντάπασι ποιητικήν, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ὀλίγον ἐκβεβηκυῖαν τῆς ἐν ἔθει· ἀνιαρὸν γὰρ ὁ κόρος καὶ τῶν πάνυ ἡδέων,[2] ἡ δὲ συμμετρία πανταχῇ χρήσιμον.

52 Εἷς ἔτι μοι καταλείπεται λόγος ⟨ὁ⟩[3] περὶ τῶν μιμησαμένων τὸν ἄνδρα ῥητόρων τε καὶ συγγραφέων, ⟨ἀναγκαῖος μὲν ὤν⟩,[4] ὥσπέρ τις καὶ ἄλλος, εἰς τὴν συντέλειαν τῆς ὑποθέσεως, ὄκνον δέ τινα καὶ πολλὴν εὐλάβειαν ἡμῖν παρέχων, μή τινα παράσχωμεν ἀφορμὴν διαβολῆς τοῖς πάντα συκοφαντεῖν εἰωθόσιν ἀλλοτρίαν τῆς ἐπιεικείας, ᾗ κεχρήμεθα καὶ περὶ τοὺς λόγους καὶ περὶ τὰ ἤθη·

[1] *συγκριτὸς* Sylburg: *συγκριτικὸς* codd.
[2] *ἡδέων* Krüger: *ἀηδῶν* codd.
[3] *ὁ* inseruit Sadée.
[4] *ἀναγκαῖος μὲν ὤν* addidit Reiske.

---

[1] See note 4, p. 229.
[2] c. 455–360 B.C. Disciple of Socrates and founder of the Cynic sect.

Critias,[1] Antisthenes,[2] Xenophon[3] and the other companions of Socrates. It is clear from all these facts that Thucydides was the first to write in this style, and that he did so in order to be different from the other historians. Whenever he uses it with controlled moderation he is superb and in a class of his own; but when he uses it excessively and in breach of good taste, without discrimination of circumstances or regard for the degree required, he deserves censure. My own view would be that history should not be written in an arid, unadorned and commonplace style: it should contain an element of artistry; and yet it should not be entirely artificial, but should be just a step removed from everyday language.[4] Excess is an abomination even in quite pleasant things, whereas moderation is everywhere desirable.

There still remains one subject for me to discuss, 52
that of Thucydides's imitators among the orators and the historians. It is as essential a topic as any for the completion of my purpose; but I approach it with a certain misgiving and great caution, since I do not wish to present those men who make indiscriminate slander their profession with an opportunity to make a sweeping indictment, by saying something which would ill accord with the spirit of fairness in which I have conducted my discussion of literature and the character ⟨of writers⟩. These critics may think me

[3] *c.* 426–355 B.C. Author of the *Anabasis*, the *Hellenica*, the *Cyropaedia*, the *Oeconomicus*, the *Memorabilia of Socrates* and some minor works; but hardly a typical representative of Attic prose style of the late 5th century, since most of his large output is to be assigned to the years 390–355 B.C., during much of which time he was living in exile: a fact which is reflected in many deviations from Attic usage.

[4] See note 1, p. 305.

οἷς τάχα βάσκανόν τι καὶ κακόηθες πρᾶγμα δόξομεν, εἰ τοὺς μὴ καλῶς τῇ μιμήσει χρησαμένους παράγομεν καὶ παρεχόμεθα τὰς γραφὰς αὐτῶν, ἐφ' αἷς μέγιστον ἐφρόνουν ἐκεῖνοι καὶ δι' ἃς πλούτους τε μεγάλους ἐκτήσαντο καὶ δόξης λαμπρᾶς κατηξιώθησαν. ἵνα δὲ μηδεμία ὑποψία καθ' ἡμῶν τοιαύτη γένηται, τὸ μὲν ἐπιτιμᾶν τισι καὶ μεμνῆσθαι τῶν ἡμαρτημένων αὐτοῖς ἐάσομεν· περὶ δὲ τῶν κατορθωσάντων ἐν τῇ μιμήσει μικρὰ προσθέντες ἔτι καταπαύσομεν αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον. συγγραφέων μὲν οὖν ἀρχαίων, ὅσα κἀμὲ εἰδέναι, Θουκυδίδου μιμητὴς οὐδεὶς ἐγένετο κατὰ ταὐτά γε, καθ' ἃ δοκεῖ μάλιστα τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρειν, κατὰ τὴν γλωσσηματικὴν καὶ ἀπηρχαιωμένην καὶ ποιητικὴν καὶ ξένην λέξιν, καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὑπερβατοὺς καὶ πολυπλόκους καὶ ἐξ ἀποκοπῆς πολλὰ σημαίνειν πράγματα βουλομένας καὶ διὰ μακροῦ τὰς ἀποδόσεις λαμβανούσας νοήσεις, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις κατὰ τοὺς σκαιοὺς καὶ πεπλανημένους ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν συζυγίας καὶ οὐδ' ἐν ἁπάσῃ ποιητικῇ χώραν ἔχοντας σχηματισμούς, ἐξ ὧν ἡ πάντα λυμαινομένη τὰ καλὰ καὶ σκότον παρέχουσα ταῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀσάφεια παρῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς λόγους.

53 Ῥητόρων δὲ Δημοσθένης μόνος, ὥσπερ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσοι μέγα τι καὶ λαμπρὸν ἔδοξαν ποιεῖν ἐν λόγοις, οὕτω καὶ Θουκυδίδου ζηλωτὴς ἐγένετο κατὰ πολλὰ καὶ προσέθηκε τοῖς πολιτικοῖς λόγοις παρ' ἐκείνου λαβών, ἃς οὔτε Ἀντιφῶν οὔτε Λυσίας οὔτε Ἰσοκράτης οἱ πρωτεύσαντες τῶν τότε ῥητόρων ἔσχον ἀρετάς, τὰ τάχη λέγω καὶ τὰς συστροφὰς καὶ τοὺς τόνους καὶ τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ

carping and malicious if I introduce authors who did not imitate him well, and quote from them passages of which they themselves were very proud and which won for them great wealth and distinction. In order to allay any such suspicion of sinister intentions, I shall refrain from any specific criticisms of such authors, and shall not refer to any faults. But I shall append some brief examples of successful imitation and then conclude my discussion. No historian, so far as I know, of the older generation has imitated the most distinctive qualities of Thucydides's style—his recondite, archaic, artificial, exotic language, his suspended, involved sentences and distorted phrases, which are designed to convey several ideas in an elliptical manner, and whose conclusions are delayed for a long time; and in addition, his awkward and waywardly unnatural collocations of words, and his use of certain figures which would not even find a place in any kind of poetry: features which have produced that obscurity which mars all his fine qualities and overshadows his real merits.

Demosthenes, alone among the orators, imitated 53
Thucydides in many ways, just as he did all who seemed to him to have achieved greatness and distinction in their field; and he added to his political speeches many virtues that he derived from Thucydides, and which neither Antiphon, nor Lysias, nor Isocrates, the leading orators of the day, had acquired: I mean rapid movement, conciseness, intensity, pun-

στριφνὸν καὶ τὴν ἐξεγείρουσαν τὰ πάθη δεινότητα· τὸ δὲ κατάγλωσσον τῆς λέξεως καὶ ξένον καὶ ποιητικὸν οὐχ ἡγησάμενος ἐπιτήδεια τοῖς ἀληθινοῖς ἀγῶσι παρέλιπε, καὶ οὐδὲ τῶν σχημάτων τὸ πεπλανημένον ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθίας καὶ τὸ σολοικοφανὲς ἠγάπησεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς συνήθεσιν ἔμεινε, ταῖς μεταβολαῖς καὶ τῇ ποικιλίᾳ καὶ τῷ μηδὲν ἁπλῶς ἀσχημάτιστον ἐκφέρειν νόημα κοσμῶν τὴν φράσιν. τὰς δὲ πολυπλόκους νοήσεις καὶ πολλὰ δηλούσας ἐν ὀλίγοις καὶ διὰ μακροῦ κομιζομένας τὴν ἀκολουθίαν καὶ ἐκ παραδόξου τὰ ἐνθυμήματα φερούσας ἐζήλωσέν τε καὶ προσέθηκε τοῖς τε δημηγορικοῖς καὶ τοῖς δικανικοῖς λόγοις, ἧττον μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδιωτικῶν, δαψιλέστερον δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν δημοσίων ἀγώνων.

54 Θήσω δ' ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων παραδείγματα, πολλῶν ὄντων ὀλίγα καὶ τοῖς ἀνεγνωκόσι τὸν ἄνδρα ἀρκοῦντα. ἔστι δή τις αὐτῷ δημηγορία τὴν μὲν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχουσα περὶ τοῦ πρὸς βασιλέα πολέμου, παρακαλοῦσα δὲ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μὴ προχείρως αὐτὸν ἄρασθαι, ὡς οὔτε τῆς οἰκείας αὐτῶν δυνάμεως ἀξιομάχου πρὸς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ὑπαρχούσης οὔτε τῆς συμμαχικῆς πιστῶς καὶ βεβαίως τῶν κινδύνων ἀντιληψομένης· παρακαλεῖ τε αὐτοὺς παρασκευασαμένους τὴν ἑαυτῶν δύναμιν φανεροὺς εἶναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ὅτι τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπάντων ἐλευθερίας κίνδυνον ὑπομενοῦσιν, ἐάν τις ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἴῃ· πρὸ δὲ τοῦ παρασκευάσασθαι πρέσβεις οὐκ ἐᾷ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀποστέλλειν τοὺς καλέσοντας αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον, ὡς οὐχ ὑπακουσομένους. τοῦτο λαβὼν τὸ νόημα κατε-

gency, concentration and the rhetorical power that arouses emotion. On the other hand he passed over his use of bizarre, strange and artificial language, considering these unsuitable for practical oratory. Nor did he approve of Thucydides's use of figures of speech which strayed from the natural sequence of the thought and had an air of solecism. He adhered to normal usage, while embellishing his speech by means of substitutions and variation, and by never expressing any idea in an absolutely straightforward way Demosthenes imitated his intricate sentences, which reveal much in a few words, extend the grammatical sequence over a long distance and convey the thought in an unexpected way. He introduced these features into his political and forensic speeches, using them less in the private, more lavishly in the public suits.

I shall quote a few examples from the large 54
number of both kinds available: these will be sufficient for those who have read his works. One of his political speeches concerns a proposed war against the Great King. In it he warns the Athenians not to 354 B.C.
start the war precipitately, because their available resources are no match for those of the Great King, and they cannot rely on their allies to stand by them and share the danger. He further urges them to make their own forces ready for war and to advertise to the rest of Greece their intention to risk their own security in defence of the freedom of all if anyone should attack them. But he advises them against sending ambassadors to the other Greeks to summon them to join the war before such preparations have been made, on the ground that they will not comply.

σκεύακέν τε καὶ ἐσχημάτικεν οὕτως· "Τότε δέ, ἐὰν ἄρα ἃ νῦν οἰόμεθα ἡμεῖς πράττητε, οὐδεὶς δήπου τῶν πάντων Ἑλλήνων τηλικοῦτον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ φρονεῖ, ὅστις ὁρῶν χιλίους ἱππέας, ὁπλίτας δὲ ὅσους ἂν ἐθέλῃ τις, ναῦς δὲ τριακοσίας οὐχ ἥξει καὶ δεήσεται, μετὰ τούτων ἀσφαλέστατ' ἂν ἡγούμενος σωθῆναι· οὐκοῦν ἐκ μὲν τοῦ καλεῖν ἤδη τὸ δεῖσθαι κἂν μὴ τύχητε ἐφαμαρτεῖν, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μετὰ τοῦ παρασκευάσασθαι τὰ ὑμέτερα αὐτῶν ἐπισχεῖν δεομένους σῴζειν καὶ εὖ εἰδέναι πάντας ἥξοντας ἔστι." ταῦτα ἐξήλλακται μὲν ἐκ τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ συνήθους τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀπαγγελίας, καὶ κρείττονά ἐστιν ἢ κατὰ τὸν ἰδιώτην· οὐ μὴν ἐσκότισταί γε οὐδὲ ἀσαφῆ γέγονεν ὥστε ἐξηγήσεως δεῖσθαι. ἀρξάμενός τε ὑπὲρ τῆς παρασκευῆς λέγειν ταῦτα ἐπιτίθησιν· "ἔστι δὲ πρῶτον τῆς παρασκευῆς, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ μέγιστον, οὕτω διακεῖσθαι τὰς γνώμας ὑμᾶς, ὡς ἕκαστον ἑκόντα προθύμως ὅ τι ἂν δέῃ ποιήσοντα. ὁρᾶτε γάρ, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὅτι ὅσα μὲν πώποτε ἐβουλήθητε καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸ πράττειν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ προσήκειν ἡγήσατο, οὐδὲν πώποτε ὑμᾶς ἐξέφυγεν· ὅσα δ' ἐβουλήθητε μέν, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ἀπεβλέψατε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ὡς αὐτὸς μὲν οὐ ποιήσων, τὸν δὲ πλησίον τὰ δέοντα πράξοντα, οὐδὲν πώποτε ὑμῖν ἐγένετο." καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα πέπλεκται μὲν ἡ διάνοια πολυπλόκως, λέλεκται δ' ἐκ τῆς κοινότητος εἰς τὴν ἀσυνήθη φράσιν ἐκβεβη-

[1] xiv. 13.
[2] xiv. 14.

This is how Demosthenes has presented and elaborated this theme:[1]

"But when the time comes, if you actually do what we now think you intend, I fancy none of the Greek communities rates itself so highly that, when they see a thousand cavalry, as many infantry as you like and three hundred ships, they will not come cap in hand, regarding such aid as their surest hope of deliverance. The position is that by inviting them now you are suppliants, and if your petition fails you also miss your objective; whereas, by biding your time and completing your preparations, you become their saviours at their request, and can be sure that they will all come over to you."

This is far from the manner of most political debate with which most people are familiar, and would be beyond the capabilities of an ordinary speaker. But it has not become befogged and obscure to the point of requiring elucidation. Having begun to discuss the subject of preparations, he continues:[2]

"The first and most important factor in preparation is that you should have your minds made up that each one of you is going to do his duty, whatever it may be, not only willingly but enthusiastically. You can see, Athenians, that whenever a common resolution of yours has been followed by an acceptance of responsibility for action by every man, none of your objectives has ever eluded you, but that you have never been successful when, after resolving to do something, you have looked to one another, each man intending to do nothing while his neighbour did the work."

Here the thought has been intricately interwoven, and normal language has been avoided in favour of unfamiliar expression; but the danger of excess is

κότα, φυλάττεται δὲ τὸ περιττὸν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ σαφεῖ. Ἐν δὲ τῇ μεγίστῃ τῶν κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγοριῶν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εὐθὺς οὕτως κατεσκεύακεν· "Πολλῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, λόγων γιγνομένων ὀλίγου δεῖν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν, περὶ ὧν Φίλιππος ἀφ' οὗ τὴν εἰρήνην ἐποιήσατο οὐ μόνον ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀδικεῖ· καὶ πάντων οἶδ' ὅτι φησάντων γ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ καὶ ποιοῦσι τοῦτο, καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν, ὅπως ἐκεῖνος παύσεται τῆς ὕβρεως καὶ δίκην δώσει, εἰς τοῦτο ὑπηγμένα πάντα τὰ πράγματα καὶ προειμένα ὁρῶ, ὥστε δέδοικα μὴ βλάσφημον μὲν εἰπεῖν, ἀληθὲς δέ· εἰ καὶ λέγειν ἅπαντες ἐβούλοισθ' οἱ παριόντες καὶ χειροτονεῖν ὑμεῖς ἐξ ὧν ὡς φαυλότατα ἔμελλε τὰ πράγματα ἕξειν, οὐκ ἂν ἡγοῦμαι δύνασθαι χεῖρον ἢ νῦν διατεθῆναι." ὅμοια δὲ τούτοις ἐστὶ κἀκεῖνα· "εἶτ' οἴεσθε, εἰ μὲν αὐτὸν μηδὲν ἐποίησαν κακόν, μὴ παθεῖν δὲ φυλάξαιντο ἴσως, τούτους μὲν ἐξαπατᾶν αἱρεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ προλέγοντα βιάζεσθαι, ὑμῖν δ' ἐκ προρρήσεως πολεμήσειν, καὶ ταῦθ' ἕως ἂν ⟨ἑκόντες⟩ ἐξαπατᾶσθε;" Ἐν δὲ τῷ κρατίστῃ τῶν δικανικῶν, τῷ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου γραφέντι λόγῳ τῆς Φιλίππου δεινότητος, ᾗ κατεστρατηγήκει τὰς πόλεις, μνησθεὶς οὕτω τὴν διάνοιαν ἐσχημάτικεν· "καὶ οὐκέτι προστίθημι, ὅτι τῆς μὲν ὠμότητος, ἣν ἐν οἷς καθάπαξ τινῶν κατέστη κύριος ὁ Φίλιππος ἔστιν

[1] *Phil.* iii. 1.
[2] *Phil.* iii. 13.
[3] *De Corona*, 231. Feigned omission was a recognised

guarded against by the fact that the meaning is clear. In the greatest of his political speeches against Philip, 341 B.C. right at the outset he arranges the very first sentence in the following way:[1]

"Although many speeches have been made, Athenians, in almost every meeting of the Assembly about the offences which Philip has committed since he signed the treaty of peace, not only against you but against all other states; and although everyone, I am sure, would say, if they do not actually say, that our counsels and our actions should be directed to curbing his insolence and bringing him to book, nevertheless I observe that all our affairs have reached such a pass through negligence that—I am afraid that this, though offensive to say, is true—if all the orators had wanted to come forward with proposals, and you to vote for those which would be most disastrous for your interests, I do not think they could have been reduced to a worse state than they are in today."

What follows later is in a similar vein:[2]

"Do you then suppose that, although he chose to deceive people who did not harm him, but might perhaps have defended themselves, rather than attack them after due warning, he will declare war upon you before attacking, especially while you are still willing to be deceived?"

And in his most powerful forensic oration, the speech *On the Crown*, after mentioning Philip's clever- 330 B.C. ness in outgeneralling the cities, he expresses his thought in the following figure:[3]

"I refrain from adding the fact that others have experienced the cruelty of Philip, which can be seen

figure of thought, *εἰρώνεια, παράλειψις*, Latin *occultatio, praeteritio.*

ἰδεῖν, ἑτέροις πειραθῆναι συνέβη, τῆς δὲ φιλανθρωπίας, ἣν τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκεῖνος περιβαλλόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπλάττετο, ὑμεῖς καλῶς ποιοῦντες τοὺς καρποὺς ἐκομίσασθε." καὶ ἐν οἷς τοὺς προδιδόντας τῷ Φιλίππῳ τὰ πράγματα πάντων αἰτίους ἀποφαίνει τῶν συμβεβηκότων τοῖς Ἕλλησι κακῶν, κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως γράφει·[1] "καίτοι νὴ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ πάντας θεούς, εἴ γ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας δέοι σκοπεῖσθαι ἢ τὸ καταψεύδεσθαι καὶ δι' ἔχθραν τι λέγειν ἀνελόντας ἐκ μέσου, τίνες ὡς ἀληθῶς ἦσαν οἷς ἂν εἰκότως καὶ δικαίως τὴν τῶν γεγενημένων αἰτίαν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀναθεῖεν ἅπαντες, τοὺς ὁμοίους τούτῳ παρ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν πόλεων εὕροιτ' ἄν, οὐχὶ τοὺς ἐμοί· οἳ ὅτ' ἦν ἀσθενῆ τὰ Φιλίππου πράγματα καὶ κομιδῇ μικρά, πολλάκις προλεγόντων ἡμῶν καὶ παρακαλούντων καὶ διδασκόντων τὰ βέλτιστα, τῆς ἰδίας ἕνεκ' αἰσχροκερδείας τὰ κοινῇ συμφέροντα προΐεντο, τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας ἑκάστοις πολίτας ἐξαπατῶντες καὶ διαφθείροντες, ἕως δούλους ἐποίησαν."

55 Μυρία παραδείγματα φέρειν δυναίμην ἂν ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Δημοσθένους λόγων τῶν τε δημηγορικῶν καὶ τῶν δικανικῶν, ἃ παρὰ τὸν Θουκυδίδου κατεσκεύασται χαρακτῆρα τὸν ἐν τῇ κοινῇ καὶ συνήθει διαλέκτῳ τὴν ἐξαλλαγὴν ἔχοντα. ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ μακρότερος τοῦ δέοντος ὁ λόγος γένοιτό μοι, τούτοις ἀρκεσθεὶς ἱκανοῖς οὖσι βεβαιῶσαι τὸ προκείμενον οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμι τοῖς ἀσκοῦσι τοὺς πολιτικοὺς λόγους ὑποτίθεσθαι τοῖς γε δὴ τὰς

[1] γράφει Sadée: γράφων codd.

in the case of those whom he has once got completely into his hands; while of the generosity which he has feigned towards you while securing the rest of his objectives, you have been fortunate to enjoy the fruits."

And in the passage where he is accusing those who betrayed the cause of Greece to Philip of responsibility for all her misfortunes, he writes the following words:[1]

"But, by Heracles and all the gods, if one had examined the question sincerely, discarding all falsehood and malice, who the men really are, on whom the blame for what has happened may by common consent fairly and justly be thrown, you would find that they are the politicians in the several states who are like Aeschines here, not those like me—men who, when Philip's power was weak and quite insignificant, and we were constantly warning you, advising you and instructing you in the best policies, sacrificed the state's interests to gratify their shameful greed, deceiving and corrupting their respective countrymen until they made them slaves."

I could furnish countless examples from the poli- 55
tical and forensic speeches of Demosthenes which are composed in a style like that with which Thucydides succeeds in being different while using ordinary and familiar language. But in order that my treatise should not become unnecessarily long, I shall content myself with these examples, which are sufficient to prove my thesis. I should not hesitate to suggest to students of political oratory—those, at least, who still try to keep their critical faculties unprejudiced—that

[1] *De Corona*, 294.

κρίσεις ἀδιαστρόφους ἔτι φυλάσσουσι, Δημοσθένει συμβούλῳ χρησαμένους, ὃν ἁπάντων ῥητόρων κράτιστον γεγενῆσθαι πειθόμεθα, ταύτας μιμεῖσθαι τὰς κατασκευάς, ἐν αἷς ἥ τε βραχύτης καὶ ἡ δεινότης καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς καὶ ὁ τόνος καὶ ἡ μεγαλοπρέπεια καὶ αἱ συγγενεῖς ταύταις ἀρεταὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις εἰσὶ φανεραί· τὰς δὲ αἰνιγματώδεις καὶ δυσκαταμαθήτους καὶ γραμματικῶν ἐξηγήσεων δεομένας καὶ πολὺ τὸ βεβασανισμένον καὶ τὸ σολοικοφανὲς ἐν τοῖς σχηματισμοῖς ἐχούσας μήτε θαυμάζειν μήτε μιμεῖσθαι. ἵνα δὲ συνελὼν εἴπω, ἀμφότερα μὲν ἐπ' ἴσης ζηλωτὰ εἶναι, τά τε μὴ σαφῶς εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ συγγραφέως καὶ τὰ προσειληφότα σὺν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς τὴν σαφήνειαν, οὐκ ἔχει λόγον· ἀνάγκη δὲ ὁμολογεῖν κρείττονα τῶν ἀτελεστέρων εἶναι τὰ τελειότερα καὶ τῶν ἀφανεστέρων τά γ' ἐμφανέστερα. τί οὖν μαθόντες ἅπασαν τὴν διάλεκτον τοῦ συγγραφέως ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ βιαζόμεθα λέγειν, ὅτι τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν οὖσιν ἀνθρώποις αὐτὰ ὁ Θουκυδίδης ἔγραψε συνήθη πᾶσι καὶ γνώριμα ὄντα, ἡμῶν δὲ λόγος αὐτῷ τῶν ὕστερον ἐσομένων οὐκ ἦν, οἳ δ' ἐκβάλλομεν ἐκ τῶν δικαστηρίων καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἅπασαν τὴν Θουκυδίδου λέξιν ὡς ἄχρηστον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸ διηγηματικὸν μέρος αὐτῆς πλὴν ὀλίγων πάνυ θαυμαστῶς ἔχειν καὶ εἰς πάσας εἶναι τὰς χρείας εὔθετον, τὸ δὲ δημηγορικὸν οὐχ ἅπαν εἰς μίμησιν ἐπιτήδειον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ μέρος γνωσθῆναι μὲν ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις εὔπορον, κατασκευασθῆναι δ' οὐχ ἅπασι δυνατόν;

they should take Demosthenes as their guide, as I am persuaded that he was the finest of the orators.[1] They should imitate those specimens of his composition in which his brevity, rhetorical power, force, intensity, impressiveness and other related virtues are plain for all men to see; while those which are allusive and difficult to follow, and require a commentary, and those which are full of tortured and apparently ungrammatical constructions deserve neither to be admired nor imitated. To sum up, it does not make sense for us to admire equally the passages in Thucydides which lack clarity and those which possess clarity in addition to his other virtues; for it must be admitted that perfection is better than imperfection, and clarity is better than obscurity. What reasoning, therefore, has led some of us to praise Thucydides's style as a whole, and to insist on asserting that he wrote his history for his contemporaries, and that the language in which it was written was familiar and comprehensible to all of them, but that he took no thought for us, his future readers; while others of us banish all his work from our law-courts and assemblies as being worthless, instead of agreeing that the narrative portions of it, except for very few passages, deserve to be admired and used for every sort of purpose, while the speeches, though they are not all suitable for imitation, contain a good proportion of passages which all men can easily understand, though they cannot all compose in the same style?

[1] See note 2, p. 373. From the inclusion of "brevity" in the following list it is evident that Dionysius is thinking of historical narrative as well as speeches; which makes sense of his recommendation that Demosthenes should be the model for historians as well as for orators.

Τούτων ἡδίω μὲν εἶχόν σοι περὶ Θουκυδίδου γράφειν, ὦ βέλτιστε Κόιντε Αἴλιε Τουβέρων, οὐ μὴν ἀληθέστερα.

THUCYDIDES

I could have written an essay on Thucydides which would have given you more pleasure than this one does, my good Quintus Aelius Tubero, but not one which was more in accordance with the facts.